FREIBURGER BEITRÄGE ZUR INDOLOGIE

Herausgegeben von Ulrich Schneider, Münster

Band 21

A STUDY OF THE ŚRĀMAṆYAPHALA-SŪTRA

BY

GRAEME MACQUEEN

1988

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

A STUDY OF THE ŚRĀMAṆYAPHALA-SŪTRA

BY

GRAEME MACQUEEN

1988

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

MacQueen, Graeme:
A study of the Śrāmaṇyaphala sūtra / by Graeme MacQueen. –
Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz, 1988
(Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie ; Bd. 21)
Zugl.: Harvard Univ., Diss., 1978
ISBN 3-447-02806-8

NE: GT

Reproduktion, Druck und buchbinderische Verarbeitung:
Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Printed in Germany

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS VII

INTRODUCTION 1

The Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra 1

The Structure of the Thesis 6

The Text Family 11

I. THE VERSIONS OF THE ŚRĀMAṆYAPHALA SŪTRA 12

Description 12

Sects 18

The Translations 29

The Fruits of the Life of a Śramaṇa (C1) 29

The Fruits of the Life of a Samaṇa (C2) 51

Faith Without Roots (C3) 72

C4 (untitled) 90

S (untitled) 99

II. THE ANCIENT TEXT 104

The Place of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra in the Canon 104

Mahāsāṅghika Evidence 117

Comparative Analysis 118

Opening Formula 118

Beginning of the Narrative 120

Journey to the Buddha 138

Meeting of the King and the Buddha 140

The King's Question and the Buddha's Response 144

The Visits to the Six Heretics 148

The Buddha's Discourse 168

Outcome and Conclusion 183

Closing Formula 189

Textual Affiliations 189
Sectarian Affiliations 192
The Ancient Text 195

III. THEMES AND THEMATIC CHANGE 199

Themes 200

The Fruits of the Life of a Śramaṇa (A) 200
The Conversion of King Ajātaśatru 214
The Theme of Peace 233
Internal and External Mastery 245
The Buddha's Skill as a Teacher 259
Action and Recompense 269
The Fruits of the Life of a Śramaṇa (B) 278

Thematic Change 282

Types of Change 282
Degree of Change 285

CONCLUSION 291

APPENDIX 295

The Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra in Art 295

ABBREVIATIONS 299

BIBLIOGRAPHY 301

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research of which this dissertation is the outcome was made possible by a fellowship from the Canada Council.

I must express gratitude to the many people at Harvard's Center for the Study of World Religions--teachers, fellow students and other friends--who contributed to my education. Special thanks are due to my advisor, Professor Masatoshi Nagatomi, who gave of his time and assistance well beyond the call of duty during my stay at Harvard. I am also grateful to the other readers of the thesis, Professors Carman and Ingalls, for their insight and criticism.

The thesis was written while I was Lecturer at McMaster University, and I have received assistance from many friends and colleagues in Canada. Professor Fujimoto, formerly of the University of Toronto, went to great lengths to help me with the Tibetan material. Gregory Schopen was generous in providing bibliographical aid in the initial stages of research. Professors Shinohara, Granoff and Jan of McMaster were supportive and helpful in numerous ways. I am indebted (as is the reader) to Bart Tsui for writing the Chinese characters.

I find it impossible to express adequately my gratitude to my wife Sharon for the help she has given me at all stages of this work, and only say that without her it would never have been brought to completion. And I thank her in addition for a number of particularly important substantive suggestions for the improvement of the thesis.

INTRODUCTION

Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra

According to Buddhist tradition the king of Magadha, Ajātaśatru, once visited the Buddha and put a question to him regarding the worth of a life spent in religious quest. He asked what was the fruit of the life of an ascetic, or *śramaṇa*. He wanted to know what concrete benefit, what visible result, issued from such a life. At the Buddha's request he recounted the answers he had received when he earlier put the same question to several prominent religious leaders of the day (the famous "six heretics"). And he expressed his dissatisfaction with their replies.

We are told that the Buddha then took up the task of answering the king's question, and when he had concluded Ajātaśatru not only expressed his satisfaction with the discourse, but was moved to confess the evil deed that was weighing on his mind--he had put to death his father, Bimbisāra, in order that he might rule the kingdom--and "took refuge" with the Buddha, becoming thereby a Buddhist lay-supporter.

These events are recorded in the *Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra*, a text belonging to the canon of Small Vehicle Buddhism, and, more precisely, belonging from an early date to the *Dīrgha Āgama*.[1] This work is well known to Western scholarship (albeit almost exclusively through its

---

[1]See the discussion below, pp. 107ff.

Pali version), chiefly because the doctrines of the six heretics, which are of great interest to students of Indian intellectual history, are here given in detail. While this material is certainly of outstanding importance, it is unfortunate that the remainder of the text has received scant attention. The sutra is not merely a repository for the doctrines of the six heretics. It is here, for example, that Ajātaśatru, a common and fascinating figure in Buddhist legend, makes his canonical debut.[2] Whether the events described in the sutra are historical or not they deserve study in so far as they form the basis for much of the subsequent legend. In addition, the *Śrāmaṇyaphala* is one of the few pieces of Buddhist literature that takes the issue of the fruits of the *śramaṇa*'s life as its explicit topic. Much is said relative to this problem in the canon, but it is of special value to have a work devoted to the theme. The *śramaṇa* was one who, in his pursuit of moral improvement and wisdom, abandoned his family, wealth and occupation for a homeless mendicant life. He stands at the heart of the radical religious and philosophical search that characterizes this period of Indian history. The king's question concerns the founda-

---

[2]For a description of the Ajātaśatru legend in the Pali literature, see G. P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* (London: Luzac, 1960), *s.v.* Ajātasattu. A somewhat more comprehensive account is given by H. G. A. van Zeyst in G. P. Malalasekara, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* (Ceylon: Government Press, 1961), *s.v.* Ajātasattu. With regard to the king's appearance in the Chinese sources one may consult *Daizōkyō sakuin* 大藏經索引 : *Index to the Taisho Tripitaka* (Tokyo: Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo Kanko Kai, 1975-), *s.v.* 阿闍世. He also appears in Jain scripture. See the references in R. C. Majumdar, ed., *The Age of Imperial Unity* (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1960), pp. 22ff.

tions of the śramaṇa movement, and hence the foundations of Buddhism, which was part of this movement.

While our sutra thus has significant unique features, it also shares a great deal with other early Buddhist literature, and is particularly typical of the lengthy "dialogues of the Buddha".[3] Characteristically, the Buddha is confronted by a person of different values and beliefs, who has an alternative perception of the world; characteristically, the Buddha discourses with him, helps him to the resolution of his particular problem, and wins his support for the Buddhist movement. The study of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra is hence gnificant not only to the extent that it illuminates features unique o this text, but also to the extent that it casts light on the larger body of related literature, which has thus far not received the attention it deserves.

Lastly, this work is an apt object of study due to the large number of versions of it that have survived. There are at least seven of them and, although not all are genuinely distinct and not all are complete, several separate lines of transmission are represented. A comparative study of them is bound to add to our knowledge of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra, in terms of both its history and its meaning, and should in addition contribute to the broader field of Buddhist textual studies, which is still plagued with historical and methodological uncertainties.

---

[3] This term was used by T. W. Rhys Davids to refer to the Dīgha and Majjhima Nikāyas (see, for example, Dialogues, I, ix), and is still sometimes useful.

The group of texts in question has been little studied. Thirty years ago P. V. Bapat gave a description of the majority of the existing versions in his article, "The Śrāmaṇyphala-Sūtra and Its Different Versions in Buddhist Literature".[4] This is a valuable contribution, but necessarily limited by its brevity. In addition, over the years parts of nearly all versions have appeared in translation,[5] but there has been no attempt to collect these and carry out a critical comparative analysis. Most of the comments that have been made relative to our sutra, in fact, have been limited to one particular version of it, the Pali Sāmaññaphala Sutta. Failure to take the other versions into account had made most of these comments of doubtful worth. For example, the Sāmaññaphala has been treated as if its main distinguishing feature, apart from the material relating to the six heretics, is the long section it contains dealing with the self-cultivation of the monk.[6] This section is what chiefly characterizes the sutras of the first third

---

[4]Indian Culture, XV (1948-49), 107-114.

[5]References are given below, pp. 13ff.

[6]P. V. Bapat, "The Different Strata in the Literary Material of the Dīgha Nikāya", Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, VIII (1926), 4. G. C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism (Allahabad: University of Allahabad, 1957), pp. 82ff. See also T. W. Rhys Davids' Introduction to the sutra, Dialogues, I, 56ff. and B. C. Law's remarks in his A History of Pāli Literature (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1933), I, 84.

Some of the best work on the document in question has been done by R. O. Franke, in his various studies of the "Heilswegschema" of the Dīgha Nikāya. Despite the fact that his views on the composition of the Dīgha are not widely accepted, his comments on this document remain very helpful. See, for example, Franke, trans., Dīghanikāya (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), pp. X ff., and his article "Die Buddhalehre in ihrer erreichbar-ältesten Gestalt (im Dīghanikāya)", Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LXIX (1915), 482ff., and LXXI (1917), 50-77.

of the Dīgha Nikāya (the Sīlakkhandhavagga), for they almost all contain it, but it is only in the Sāmaññaphala that it is given in full, the remaining sutras simply referring to the latter for details. It looks as if the document is being borrowed from the Sāmaññaphala, and on this basis some authors have considered the Sāmaññaphala not only one of the most important sutras in the Sīlakkhandhavagga but also one of the oldest.[7] Yet the arrangement of sutras found in the other Dīrghas to which we have access is by no means the same as that of the Pali Dīgha. In none of them does the Śrāmaṇyaphala occupy this privileged position. It appears, in fact, that the document in question has no special relation to our text, and if it is true that it originally belonged to one particular sutra (which is by no means certain) there is no reason to believe that the Śrāmaṇyaphala was that sutra.[8] As a result, neither the antiquity nor the special importance of our text relative to the other literature in question is established, nor is it safe to regard the section devoted to the monk's spiritual training as its essence and identifying mark.

Efforts to determine different chronological layers in the sutra have likewise been premature.[9] Although no attempt is made in the thesis to determine internal strata, the establishment of a primitive

---

[7]Pande, ibid., pp. 24, 82ff.; Dialogues, I, 59.

[8]For a more detailed discussion of this issue, see below, pp. 178ff., 265-266.

[9]I refer here especially to Pande's Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, pp. 82ff.

text of relatively certain age should make research along these lines more profitable.

Structure of the Thesis

In the present work attention will be given to both the form and content of the sutra. This will involve three separate and equally important tasks: presentation of the text, textual criticism, and literary criticism.

Presentation of the text involves the description of extant versions and the translation of those hitherto inaccessible or in need of retranslation. This task is taken up in Chapter I. In a case where versions of a text differ but little from one another the separate translation of each version is tedious and unnecessary, but in the present case the variations are considerable. Furthermore, the texts are rich in a way that no single interpretation of them can be, and the reader is through the translations freed from dependence upon the acuity of the interpreter.

Chapter II is devoted to textual criticism, which here refers to the process of subjecting the extant versions of a text to comparative analysis, aiming to discover the relationships among them and their relative antiquity (or the antiquity of particular parts) and to reconstruct an earlier text from which the present forms are descended. The nature of an exercise in textual criticism will depend upon the method utilized and the sources available. Method and texts are both discussed later in the thesis, but some general comments on the nature of the sources may be helpful here.

Of the numerous sectarian Sūtra Piṭakas once in existence only one has survived intact, that of the Theravāda, preserved in the Pali language. Beyond this, surviving sutra materials are preserved largely in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese. Of these, the greatest bulk of sutra literature is in Chinese, where we have four āgamas preserved: the Dīrgha, Madhyama, Saṃyukta and Ekottara.[10] These do not belong to a single sect or community, but were transmitted by different monks during the late fourth and early fifth centuries A.D. In addition, there is a great variety of individually transmitted sutras in Chinese, as well as some originally sutra material embedded in the various Vinayas. In the present thesis most of these sources of sutra material have been utilized: besides the Pali Sāmaññaphala Sutta from the Dīgha Nikāya, we are fortunate to have versions from the Chinese Dīrgha and Ekottara, a separately transmitted version in Chinese, and versions from the Vinaya literature in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese.

Serious research into the history and sectarian affiliation of most of these sources has scarcely begun. The Pali Canon, which is not only the sole canon of a given sect to have survived intact but is also by far the longest collection to have survived in an Indian language, has naturally received more attention than other sources.[11]

---

[10]There is also a second, though incomplete, Saṃyukta in Chinese. For more detail on these matters, as well as a discussion of the Kṣudraka Āgama, see Histoire, pp. 167ff.

[11]In addition, the greater notice taken of the Pali Canon is due in large part to its having been accessible to Western scholars for a longer period of time than the other collections in question.

That it belongs to the Theravādin sect is of course well known,[12] but what its historical value is remains a "hot issue" in Buddhist studies, despite the attention given to it. To be sure, the point has by now become firmly established that in the reconstruction of ancient texts and the determination of ancient states of affairs one must use all of the available sources, regardless of their language or sect, but the question remains as to how old the Pali Canon (or particular parts of it) is in its present form, and how reliably it reflects the earliest forms of the canon of Small Vehicle Buddhism relative to the other existing sources. Scholars continue to disagree sharply on this matter. On the one hand, some persist in treating the Pali Sūtra Piṭaka as if it were the only body of sutra literature in existence belonging to Small Vehicle Buddhism; on the other hand, some feel that the Pali sources have drastically lost credibility due to the researches of the handful of scholars doing comparative textual work in this area. Edward Conze, for example, speaking of recent research into the first five hundred years of Buddhism's existence, says: "The status of the Pali Canon is here the basic problem, and there has been quite a landslide in its evaluation."[13] He goes on to say:

> The fact of the matter is that there were eighteen schools in the first period of Buddhist history, that most, if not all,

---

[12] Exactly how the Theravāda is related to the other sects of Small Vehicle Buddhism is still, however, not entirely clear. See Sectes, pp. 205ff.

[13] Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies (Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1967), p. 3.

> had their own set of Scriptures, and that each of them can equally well claim to represent the teaching of the Buddha. If the Canon of one school only, that of the Theravadins, has reached us intact and in its entirety, this is not due to its greater antiquity or intrinsic merit, but to the accidents of historical transmission.[14]

The view expressed here is, quite simply, that the Pali Canon is not the slightest bit more trustworthy historically than any of the other surviving canonical literature. In support of this opinion Conze quotes comments by Waldschmidt, in reference to the latter's well known work on the Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra,[15] and refers in addition to Hofinger's conclusion that "the Pali Canon has come down from the pedestal on which it has stood for so long; it has no more value than the Chinese and Tibetan canonical documents and occasionally it is even somewhat inferior to them."[16] Cries that the Pali Canon be removed from its pedestal continue to the present day.

Since the problem of the status of this canon has been controversial for well over a century I do not expect to solve it here, but the present study should contribute to the ongoing accumulation of evidence bearing on the issue.

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[15] Ibid., p. 5. And see Ernst Waldschmidt, Die Überlieferung von Lebensende des Buddha (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1944-48), p. 353.

[16] Conze, ibid. See M. Hofinger, Étude sur la concile de Vaiśālī (Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon, 1946), p. 257.

Chapter III of the thesis will be given largely to literary criticism. Literary criticism is most frequently taken to involve both the ascertainment of meaning and the judgement of quality; it is well to state at the outset, therefore, that the latter task is not taken up in a serious way herein. Conscious of my foreignness to the literature in question, and unwilling to carry on the tradition of cultural imperialism to which belong most Western attempts to "criticize" the scripture of other peoples, I have generally counted myself fortunate to approach an understanding of the text, seldom venturing into evaluation.

It is probably fair to say that it is now recognized in Buddhist studies that to approach scripture with the aim of extracting historical data is, while not itself invalid, a limited approach, which frequently does not allow us to get to the heart of what a text is saying. But it is still uncommon to find a recognition of the inadequacy of the attempt to extract "doctrine" from Buddhist texts without regard for narrative setting. About two thirds of the Buddhist canon (the Sutra and Vinaya portions) are formally structured as narrative: we are presented with accounts of events. Regardless of whether these are fictional or non-fictional accounts, it seems likely that part of what is being expressed is to be found in the story itself, and not merely in the explicit dogma that may be embedded in the story. As far as the Sūtra Piṭaka is concerned, the amount of true narrative is considerably smaller than the amount of formal narrative--some sutras, despite the establishment of setting in time and place and the pretense of describing events, are really just repositories of doctrine--but the quantity of true narrative is nonetheless very significant, especially in the

lengthy sutras of the Dīrgha Āgama. It seems wise to try to find an approach that will do justice to this means of communicating truth, and Chapter III has been written with this goal in mind.

The Text Family

It will quickly be seen that what we are concerned with in this study is not really one text but a group of historically and thematically related texts, a "text family". Like a biological family, they have features in common and derive from a common source but are by no means identical. It is certainly important to strive to discover the ancestor of these texts, and considerable attention will be given to this ancestor, but there is no reason to restrict our scope to the early phase of Buddhist history to which this particular form belongs. The various texts as they presently exist have long separate histories of their own, and are of great interest for the particular directions in which they take the earlier themes of the sutra, telling us much about the forces at work in the developing Buddhist scriptural tradition. The "Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra" referred to in the title of the thesis is not, therefore, to be identified with any single version, extant or reconstructed, but rather with the dynamic and diverse Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra text family.

All translations, where there is no indication to the contrary, are my own.

I

THE VERSIONS OF THE ŚRĀMAṆYAPHALA SŪTRA

Description

At least seven versions of this sutra are extant today, although not all are complete. There is one version in the Pali language, one (or two) in Sanskrit, one in Tibetan, and four in Chinese. They are as follows:

(1) The Pali version (referred to hereinafter as P)

Title: Sāmaññaphala Sutta

Date:[1] The Theravādin tradition holds that its canon was committed to writing in the latter half of the first century B.C. in Ceylon, during the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi. Those scholars who accept this account generally are of the opinion that changes in the texts were minor from this date on. Even those who do not accept it[2] are generally forced to admit that the Pali texts show themselves as having been

---

[1] "Date" refers to the time of fixation of the text in the form in which it exists today.

[2] See F. Weller, "Die Überlieferung des Älteren Buddhistischen Schrifttums", Asia Major, V (1928), 160-164. But see also Lamotte, Histoire, pp. 403-405. Weller claims that the account of the scriptures being committed to writing as found in the Dīpavaṃsa and Mahāvaṃsa has been mistakenly removed from its original context and does not really belong to the events of the period in question. Lamotte's interpretation of the Dīpavaṃsa passage, however, shows how the account may be seen to fit its present context. He suggests that it refers to the period 35-32 B.C.

closed to major change and development earlier than the texts of the other sects, insofar as we can make judgements on the basis of the literature surviving today.

Location: Dīgha Nikāya I (Sīlakkhandhavagga), sutta 2. PTS edition, pp. 47-86.

Editions and translations: The Pali canon exists in a number of modern editions. The two most accessible are the Pali Text Society's edition in Roman script (Dīgha Nikāya I first published in 1890) and the Devanāgarī edition of the Pali Publication Board, Bihar Government (Dīgha Nikāya I published in 1958).

The Sāmaññaphala Sutta has been translated into European languages a number of times. Historically interesting are the translations by Burnouf and Gogerly,[3] into French and English respectively, done around the middle of the last century. I have consulted chiefly Rhys Davids' English translation[4] and the German translations of Neumann[5] and Franke.[6] I have also taken note of a recent English translation done by the "English Editorial Department" of the Union Buddha Sāsana Council.[7] This is essentially a revision of Rhys Davids' work and

---

[3]These two may conveniently be found together in M.P. Grimblot's Sept suttas pālis tirés du Dīgha Nikāya (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1876).

[4]Dialogues, I. First published in 1899.

[5]K.E. Neumann, trans., Die Reden Gotamo Buddhos, II (3rd ed., Zurich: Artemis, 1957). First published in 1906.

[6]R. O. Franke, trans. Dīghanikāya (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913).

[7]Buddha Sāsana Council Publications, No. 31, 1958.

frequently adopts his wording; nevertheless, it is significant inasmuch as it corrects some of his more important errors.

There is a Commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya by Buddhaghosa (Sumaṅgalavilāsinī), which may be assigned to the early part of the fifth century A.D.[8]

Sect: Theravādin

(2) The Sanskrit Version (S)

Note: There are two collections of Sanskrit manuscripts extant that contain parts of our sutra. One of these is still in the process of being edited (by Tucci, Venkatacharya and others) and is supposed to be published soon in The Rome Oriental Series.[9] I have not yet been able to consult it. It appears that both collections came originally from the same find at Gilgit and that the two fragments of the Śrāmaṇya-phala Sūtra will together constitute one version. But I cannot confirm this until I have been able to compare them. Meanwhile, I have utilized the fragment that occurs in the edited collection, and the remarks below refer to it.

Title: Not mentioned, apparently, in the Ms. The editor refers to the work as the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra. This is because the Pali version

---

[8]There are also two Sub-commentaries (ṭīkā), by Dhammapāla and Ñāṇābhivaṃsa. These have not, however, been consulted in the present work.

[9]This is the material referred to some time ago by P. V. Bapat in his article: "Another Valuable Collection of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts, Containing among Others the Śrāmaṇya-phala Sūtra in Sanskrit", Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, XXX (1949), 241-253.

is called the Sāmaññaphala Sutta, and because the term śrāmaṇyaphala occurs repeatedly in the Sanskrit text. Note, however, that our text is referred to as "Faith Without Roots" (Wu-ken hsin 無根信) in the Chinese Ekottara Āgama (Tseng-i a-han 增一阿含) which expression clearly corresponds to the term amūlakā śraddhā found in the Sanskrit version.[10]

Date: According to Dutt, the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya materials found at Gilgit appear to date from the sixth century A.D.[11]

Location: Occurs in the Saṅghabhedavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya.

Editions and translations: Edited by N. Dutt, in Gilgit Manuscripts Vol. III, Part IV, pp. 213-225. Untranslated previously. The bulk of this fragment is taken up with the long document dealing with the moralities, psychic attainments, etc. Since the present study is not concerned with this material I have neglected it here and have begun my translation from where this document ends. This gives us, in effect, only the conclusion of the text.

Sect: Mūlasarvāstivādin

(3) The Tibetan Version (Tb)

Title: Does not appear to be mentioned.

Date: The translation was made in the second half of the eighth

---

[10] N. Dutt, ed., Gilgit Manuscripts (Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press, 1950), Vol. III, Part IV, p. 225.

[11] Ibid., Part II, p. i.

century,[12] apparently from a Sanskrit manuscript much like S.

Location: Like the Sanskrit version, it belongs to the Saṅghabhedavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya. It can be found in the Peking Kanjur, vol. Ce (95), fol. 238a, 4-263a, 6 (Otani Reprint, vol. 42, pp. 123-133).

Editions and translations: It has not been edited and the partial translation into English done by Rockhill in 1884 (Life, pp. 95-106) is no longer adequate. Ideally, it ought to be translated anew here, but lack of expertise in the language has made this impossible. It has, however, been consulted.

Sect: Mūlasarvāstivādin

(4) Chinese Version I (C1)

Title: Sha-men kuo ching 沙門果經.

Date: Translated into Chinese in A.D. 413 by Buddhayaśas (Fo-t'o-yeh-she 佛陀耶舍) and Chu Fo-nien 竺佛念. Buddhayaśas, who was famed for his great memory, seems to have orally transmitted the Dīrgha Āgama to which this version belongs,[13] but it is not clear whether the text had a strictly oral transmission-history up to his time.

Location: It is sutra no. 27 of the Chinese Dīrgha Āgama, and may be found in T.1, 27: vol. 1, pp. 107-109.

Editions and translations: For this and the following Chinese

---

[12] Six Heretics, p. 2.

[13] T.2059; vol. 50, pp. 333-334.

versions I have used the Taishō edition of the Chinese Tripitaka. Parts of this version have been translated into English by Nanjio (*Life*, pp. 255-259). The whole if it is translated in the present work.

Sect: Dharmaguptaka? (See the discussion below.)

(5) Chinese Version II (C2)

Title: *Chi-chih kuo ching* 寂志果經.

Date: Translated into Chinese somewhere between A.D. 381 and 395 by Chu T'an-wu-lan 竺曇無蘭. It is not known whether the translation was made from a written or a memorized text.

Location: Occurs separately rather than as a part of a larger collection. T.22: vol. 1, pp. 270-276.

Editions and translations: Parts of it have been translated by Nanjio (*Life*, pp. 255-259). Excluding only the long document beginning with the moralities, it is translated here in its entirety.

Sect: Unknown (See the discussion below.)

(6) Chinese Version III (C3)

Title: Not actually titled, but referred to as "Faith Without Roots" (*Wu-ken hsin*). See T.124: vol. 2, p. 764c, 12.

Date: Translated into Chinese in either A.D. 384 or A.D. 397, depending upon whether the translator is Dharmanandin (T'an-mo-nan-t'i 曇摩難提) or Gautama Saṅghadeva (Chü-t'an Seng-chia-t -po 瞿曇僧伽提婆). The transmission-history of the text cannot be determined without knowing which of these men transmitted it. Dharmanandin is said definitely to have committed the *Ekottara* to

memory,[14] but Gautama Saṅghadeva seems to have had a written text.[15] See the discussion below.

Location: It belongs to the Ekottara Āgama, forming the seventh sutra in the thirty-ninth fascicle, forty-third section (T.124: vol. 2, pp. 762-764).

Editions and translations: It has not previously been translated so far as I know. It is translated here in its entirety.

Sect: Unknown (See the discussion below.)

(7) Chinese Version IV (C4)

Title: Untitled

Date: Translated into Chinese in A.D. 710 by I-ching 義淨,[16] who worked with a written text.

Location: This incomplete version of the text occurs in the Saṅghabhedavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya, like S and Tb. It can be found in T.1450: vol. 24, pp. 205-206.

Editions and translations: It has been partially translated into English by Vogel in 1970 (Six Heretics, pp. 45-48), and is translated entirely in the present work.

Sects

We know the sects to which four of our texts belong. P is from the Theravādin, S, Tb and C4 are from the Mūlasarvāstivādin. The remaining three, however, are problematic.

---

[14] T.2059: vol. 50, p. 328.

[15] T.2059: vol. 50, pp. 328-329

[16] Six Heretics, p. 2.

C1

Although the Dīrgha Āgama to which this version belongs has occasionally been ascribed to the Mahīśāsaka or the Sarvāstivādin,[17] the Dharmaguptaka has been the most common choice.[18] Many arguments for this latter ascription have been offered, some based on doctrinal features of the text and some on non-doctrinal features. Under the former category mention has been made, for example, of the exaltation of the Buddha, the emphasis on stūpa worship, and the view that the body of the Arhat is completely without Outflows (anāsrava, 無漏), all of which are reputed to have been characteristics of the Dharmaguptakas.[19] Among non-doctrinal considerations, a great deal of weight has been given to the fact that the collection was transmitted by

---

[17]See Mayeda Egaku 前田惠學, Genshi Bukkyo Seiten no seiritsushi kenkyū 原始佛教聖典の成立史研究 [English title: A History of the Formation of Original Buddhist Texts] (Tokyo: Sankibo-Busshorin, 1964), pp. 619, 635. See also the remarks of Mizuno Kogen 水野弘元 in the recent edition of Kokuyaku issaikyō 國譯一切經 (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1969-71), Āgama Section, Part 7, pp. 501ff. For arguments against the Sarvāstivādin ascription, see Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽 in Indo tetsugaku kenkyū 印度哲學研究 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965), II, 135.

[18]See Mayeda and Mizuno, ibid. Most of my remarks in this section on the problem of the sects are based on Mizuno's excellent summaries in the volume referred to above and in the Āgama Section, Part 8 (pp. 424ff.) of the same series. Mayeda has been of assistance also, and is especially worth consulting for his bibliographical information.

[19]See Mizuno, ibid., Part 7, pp. 501ff., and Ui, Indo tetsugaku kenkyū, II, 135.

Buddhayaśas.[20] This Kashmirian monk is known to have transmitted the Vinaya in Four Sections (Ssu-fen Lü 四分律), which is the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka school, and it would seem to make sense that if he was familiar with this Vinaya he would have been affiliated with this school, and would have transmitted its Dīrgha Āgama. In addition, cases have been quoted where the Dīrgha and the Vinaya in Four Sections agree significantly. A typical instance is the mention in the Dīrgha of two hundred and fifty Prātimokṣa rules; it happens that of the extant Vinayas this exact number is found only in the Vinaya in Four Sections.[21]

How strong are these arguments? With regard to doctrinal points, considerable specificity is required if a strong case is to be made. It is not sufficient, certainly, to talk of the exaltation of the Buddha as a feature of a particular sect. In the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. it would have been difficult to find a school of Buddhism anywhere that did not greatly exalt the Buddha. One needs to know precisely to what extent and in what specific ways the Buddha is exalted in a text in order to make a conclusion as to sect. This has not, so far as I am aware, been convincingly done for the Dīrgha. Further, if one looks at the versions of our text translated below, he will not, I think, conclude that the Buddha is especially exalted in C1 compared with C2, C3, and C4.

---

[20] See, for example, Mizuno, ibid., p. 502.

[21] Ui, Indo tetsugaku kenkyū, II, 135.

The point that has been made about stūpa worhsip is somewhat better and, indeed, goes some distance toward answering the objection above. For it was precisely through an emphasis on stūpa worship that the Dharmaguptaka school expressed its view of the exalted nature of the Buddha.[22] It remains unclear to me, however, how frequent the references are to stūpa worship in this Dīrgha Āgama as compared with other literature of the Small Vehicle.

The third point, that of the Arhat's body being free from Outflows, is perhaps the most specific and helpful of those concerned with doctrine, and it does seem to favour the Dharmaguptaka school.[23]

As for Buddhayaśas, it seems quite possible that he could have transmitted the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas without belonging to this sect and without necessarily transmitting the Dīrgha Āgama of this sect. This objection rests on the information we are given about Buddhayaśas in The Biographies of Eminent Monks.[24] He seems to have been anything but a rigid sectarian. In addition to being acquainted with much non-Buddhist literature, he is said to have been intimate with works of both the Large and Small Vehicles. We find that he transmitted texts from both of these groups,[25] and we are

---

[22] See Bareau, Sectes, p. 192.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Kao seng chuan 高僧傳 T.2059: vol. 50, pp. 333-334.

[25] The Mahāyāna work Hsü-k'ung tsang ching 虛空藏經(Ākāśagarbha Sūtra) comes from him.

told that he helped Kumārajīva with the latter's translation of the Daśabhūmika, a Mahāyāna work. His eclecticism seems to have extended to works within the Small Vehicle, and there is little reason to believe he was acquainted only with Dharmaguptaka texts. On the contrary, he is said to have been a master of the Vibhāṣa, a Sarvāstivādin text, to the extent in fact that he was given the epithets "Red-moustache Vibhāṣa" (he had a red moustache!) and "Great Vibhāṣa". Finally, although we are clearly told that he transmitted the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas, this is not related in such a way as suggests that this was his own sect, and there is no hint given that the Dīrgha he went on to translate belonged to the same school. All things considered, this argument for the ascription of the Dīrgha to the Dharmaguptakas is hardly conclusive.

The argument based on the two hundred and fifty-rules is very weak. This same number is mentioned in the Ekottara Āgama, to which C3 belongs, and in the text of our C2.[26] Are we to believe that these three versions of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra all belonged to the same school? Surely not. This does not mean that none of these texts are Dharmaguptaka productions, but it suggests that not more than one of them is; the choice as to which one, if any, belongs to this sect must be based on other evidence.

There are, however, some cases where the Dīrgha Āgama and the Vinaya in Four Sections agree rather convincingly. Mizuno has

---

[26]For the Ekottara, see Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎, Butten no kenkyū 佛典の研究 (Tokyo, 1914), pp. 348-349. For C2, see T.22: vol. 1, p. 272c, 8-9.

recently given a good example of this,[27] namely that the accounts of the lineage of the Śākya clan as given in the two collections are very close. An objective critic, however, cannot fail to note that there are also cases where the two texts do not agree. As has been noted by many authors, for example, the order of the sutras within the Dīrgha Āgama is completely different as given in the Vinaya in Four Sections from that which we find in the extant Dīrgha.[28] These facts have not satisfactorily been explained. It is perhaps an overstatement to say, as has an eminent Japanese scholar recently, that the problem of the sect of the Dīrgha Āgama is solved (that is, that it belongs to the Dharmaguptakas);[29] nevertheless, for present purposes we may take the Dharmaguptaka ascription as the most likely one thus far proposed, and see if our own study supports this.

C2

This text is problematic in several ways. It is problematic because the Chinese translation is barbaric, clumsy and frequently obscure; it is problematic because we know hardly anything about the translator; it is problematic because we have no idea to which sect it belongs.

---

[27] Kokyuaku issaikyō, Āgama Section, Part 7, pp. 502-503.

[28] See Weller, "Die Überlieferung des Älteren Buddhistischen Schrifttums", p. 180, n. 29, and Ui, Indo tetsugaku kenkyū, II, 135. For an indication of the order of the sutras within the Dīrgha of the Dharmaguptakas, see The Vinaya of this school, at T.1428: vol. 22, p. 968c, 15ff.

[29] Mizuno: Kokuyaku issaikyō, Āgama Section, Part 7, p. 501.

The translator, Chu T'an-wu-lan 竺曇無蘭, may have come from India; his name might have been Dharmaratna.[30] He worked in the south of China during the period 381-395 A.D. and, judging from the quality of his translation, he must have received little help from Chinese monk-scholars. He is credited with some one hundred and ten translations[31] (although the sources do not agree on the exact number), approximately twenty-nine of which have survived. The great majority of his translations seem to have been of works of the Small Vehicle, many of them individual sutras drawn from the āgamas. Of these, some are purely "Small Vehicle" while others are mixed with Mahāyānist elements.[32]

It is possible that a systematic study of the translations done by this monk would lead to conclusions as to the sect to which he belonged and to which his individual works may have belonged; meanwhile, we have to leave open the question of the sect of C2 and see if our study can shed some light on the matter.

---

[30]See P. C. Bagchi, Le Canon bouddhique en Chine (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1927), I, 322ff. The suggestion of "Dharmaratna" comes from Pelliot, "Meou-tseu ou les doutes levés", T'oung Pao, XIX (1920), 344-345. He sees in the transcription T'an-wu-lan 曇無蘭 a Prakrit "Dhammaranna".

[31]See Bagchi, ibid. for these facts.

[32]Examples of purely Small Vehicle sutras are T.58: vol. 1, pp. 853ff.; T.71: vol. 1, pp. 876ff.; T.86: vol. 1, pp. 907ff. An example of a sutra with Mahāyānist elements is the peculiar Fo shuo hsin sui ching 佛說新歲經 (supposedly = Pali Pavāranā Sutta), T.62: vol. 1, pp. 859ff.

C3

The Ekottara Āgama, to which this version belongs, is a fascinating production, but again beset with numerous problems.

First, there is the problem of who translated it.[33] It appears that in A.D. 384 the monk Dharmanandin from Tukhāra, with the aid of Chu Fo-nien, completed a translation of the Ekottara Āgama. In A.D. 397 one Gautama Saṅghadeva from Kashmir, seeing that the earlier translation left something to be desired (it was accomplished hurriedly in the midst of war and rebellion), undertook to translate it again. Only one Ekottara survives today, and it is listed in some ancient sources as the work of Dharmanandin, in others as the work of Saṅghadeva. To whom does it belong?

There is no lack of complicating factors. A preface to the text by Tao-an, which gives the circumstances of its translation and other interesting details, has survived. It is situated in the Taishō edition of the Tripiṭaka at the head of the existing Ekottara. Tao-an's preface is a preface to the work of Dharmanandin; unfortunately, the description therein of the Ekottara does not quite fit the text that follows it. To make matters worse, the evidence from the Chinese translation-catalogues is thoroughly perplexing.

Without getting into the issue here I may simply report that the most common view among Japanese scholars (who have done the most

---

[33]For a discussion of this problem, see Matsumoto, Butten no kenkyū, pp. 332ff.; Mayeda, Genshi Bukkyo Seiten no seiritsushi kenkyū, pp. 669ff.; Ui, Indo tetsugaku kenkyu, II, 133ff.; Mizuno, Kokuyaku issaikyō, Āgama Section, Part 8, pp. 415ff.

detailed work) is that the present Ekottara Āgama is the work of Saṅghadeva. The earlier translation, it is claimed, has failed to survive simply because it was completely superceded[34] (although fragments of it may still exist, as Mizuno has argued).

For us, the problem of greatest urgency is that of sect. Matsumoto, in an important work on this text done some time ago,[35] suggested that it might belong to the Dharmaguptakas. He based this view partly on the fact that Saṅghadeva, whom he felt was the translator, came from Kashmir, whence the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya is known also to have come (via Buddhayaśas, as mentioned earlier). Although Kashmir is generally felt to have been a stronghold of the Sarvāstivādin sect, there are good reasons for not accepting this Ekottara as a Sarvāstivādin production;[36] hence, Matsumoto's point is worthy of consideration. His other main reason for the Dharmaguptaka ascription is less happy: there are two hundred and fifty Prātimokṣa rules mentioned by the Ekottara, which number agrees only with the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas. This point is weak, for the reasons stated earlier.

The view that has gained most supporters among Japanese scholars over the years is that the collection belongs to the Mahāsāṅghikas.[37]

---

[34] See Matsumoto and Mizuno, ibid. Other authors, such as Ui and Bagchi, feel that Saṅghadeva did not execute a separate translation but merely revised and corrected that of Dharmanandin.

[35] Butten no kenkyū, pp. 349-350.

[36] Ui, Indo tetsugaku kenkyū, II, 137.

[37] Mayeda, in the English summary appended to Genshi Bukkyo Seiten no seiritsushi kenkyū, says: "Many scholars believe that Ekottarāgama, which corresponds to Pāli AN, belongs to the Mahāsaṃghika school, although some scholars maintain other views" (p. 12). In the Japanese text of his work he goes little beyond this remark but gives valuable references: pp. 665, 671-672. See also Mizuno, Kokuyaku issaikyō, Āgama Section, Part 8, pp. 424ff.

This would, if true, give it a position of great importance for comparative and historical research. The points made in support of this position, however, do not seem to me to be sufficiently specific. Scholars have drawn attention to the statements about the supermundane nature of the Buddha's body and to the general sympathy with Mahāyāna evident in this work. These elements are particularly striking in the introductory section, but have been shown to be present throughout the whole of the text. But do these elements necessarily point to the Mahāsāṅghikas? Could they not merely be evidence of Mahāyānist influence on a Small Vehicle sect, or of the marriage of Small and Large Vehicles in a particular community? Or could this collection simply be the property of a Mahāyāna community, which chose to revere the ancient canon together with the newer vaipulya sutras? (Both are mentioned in the introductory section as canonical.)[38] Specifically Mahāyāna elements are easy to find in the text; specifically Mahāsāṅghika elements seem rare. There are, for example, the standard six perfections (pāramitā) of Mahāyāna Buddhism mentioned in the introduction:[39] we do not find the ten perfections of the Mahāvastu,[40] a Mahāsāṅghika work. A. K. Warder comments that: "the text contradicts certain doctrines of that school [the Mahāsāṅghika] (e.g. it holds, like the Sthaviravāda,

---

[38]T.125: vol. 2, p. 550c, 9-10.

[39]Ibid., p. 550a, 13ff.

[40]Mahāyāna also has a scheme of ten perfections but it is quite different from that of the Mahāvastu.

Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka, that arhants cannot relapse and there are serious discrepancies between it and the Mahāsaṃghika Vinaya, which is extant in Chinese)."[41] With regard to the second point made here, one may note that the order of the āgamas as given in the introduction to the Ekottara is different from that given in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya.[42] Also, while in the account of the First Council in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya Ānanda is humbled (and indeed soundly insulted) by Mahākāśyapa, in the Ekottara introduction the situation is quite different, Ānanda being highly praised by Mahākāśyapa.[43] Lastly, our sutra is referred to in the Ekottara as Wu-ken hsin ("Faith Without Roots"); there is no indication that it was called the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra. Yet in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya the text is referred to by the latter title.[44]

---

[41] Indian Buddhism (Delhi: Motilāl Banarsidass, 1970), p. 8.

[42] Cf. T.125: vol. 2, p. 549c, 28-29, and T.1425: vol. 22, p. 491c, 16ff. (Although see also T.1425: vol. 22, p. 492c, 18ff.)

[43] See T.1425: vol. 22, p. 491a, 21ff. and p. 492a, 20ff., and compare with the introduction to the Ekottara, T.125: vol. 2, pp. 549ff.

[44] See T.1425: vol. 2, p. 447c, 18-19 and p. 482a, 25-26. It must be admitted that these last three objections may not be serious. The order of the āgamas may not have been stable within a given sect and it may be unwise to give much weight to it. Furthermore, the positioning of the Ekottara first among in the āgamas in the introduction to that text may simply be an attempt to exalt it by those who specialized in its transmission. Similarly, the humbling of Ānanda by Mahākāśyapa and Upāli in the Vinaya and the contrary exaltation of Ānanda in the Ekottara introduction may simply reflect the prejudices of the reciters of the Vinaya and Sūtra portions of the canon. Lastly, while our text was apparently titled Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra in the Mahāsāṅghika school, the tradition about Ajātaśatru being endowed with "faith without roots" was also current there. See T.1425: vol. 22, p. 490b, 29-c, 2 and compare this with the closing lines of our C3.

The scholar who has perhaps studied the issue most carefully, Hirakawa, has concluded simply that the sect of the Ekottara is at present not known.[45] This seems to be the most reasonable position to take.

The Translations

Here follow the translations of the four Chinese texts (C1, C2, C3, C4) and the one Sanskrit text (S) described above.

Note that I have used Sanskrit almost exclusively for the restoration of terms present in the Indian texts. This has been done solely for the sake of uniformity, for it is evident from the transliterations in C1, C2 and C3 that Prakrit forms rather than Sanskrit ones are frequently attested. Hence, for example, while the term an-p'o 菴婆 (occurring in the first sentence of C1) has herein been given as "āmra", it undoubtedly represents a Prakrit "amba". Although it may seem artificial to give the Sanskrit term in such a case, I wish to avoid the very complex issue of what particular form of Prakrit is indicated in a given case.

I have followed Vogel (Six Heretics, pp. 20ff.) in the forms of the names of the six heretics.

---

[45]See Mizuno, Kokuyaku issaikyō, Āgama Section, Part 8, p. 425.

The Fruits of the Life of a Śramaṇa (C1)[46]

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was at Rājagṛha in the āmra[47] grove of Jīvaka Kumāra,[48] together with a great company of twelve hundred and fifty bhikṣus.

At that time, the king Ajātaśatru Vaidehīputra, on the fifteenth day at the time of the full moon, called to one of his ladies and addressed her: "This night is clear and bright--it is no different from day! What should I undertake to do?" The lady replied to the king: "This night of the fifteenth, the time of the full moon, is no different from day: the thing to do would be to wash the hair, bathe the body, and, together with your maidens, take joy in the five desires."

Then the king called to the Crown Prince Udāyi Bhadra[49] and addressed him: "This night, at the time of the full moon on the fifteenth day, is no different from day! What should I proceed to do?" The Crown Prince replied to the king: "This night, at the time of the full moon on the fifteenth day, is no different from day: the thing to do would be to assemble the four-fold army[50] and together lay plans for a punitive campaign against your refractory neighbours;

---

[46]Sha-men kuo ching. [47]Mango.

[48]Ch'i-chiu T'ung-tzu 耆舊童子. I avoid the difficult issue of the "original" form of Jīvaka's name.

[49]Yu-yeh P'o-t'o 優耶婆陀. The forms Udāyi (or Udāyin) and Udaya are both well attested. Both, for example, are found in the Pali manuscripts. I have adopted Udāyi throughout, since it is given in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya and hence would seem to be an ancient reading. (See T.1425: vol. 22, p. 234c, 12.)

[50]四兵. These are detailed elsewhere (e.g. C2) as involving men on elephants and horses, in chariots and on foot; the term probably stands for Skt. caturaṅgabalam.

afterwards we could return here to amuse and enjoy ourselves."

Then the king called to his courageous general[51] and addressed him: "At this time of the full moon on the fifteenth, the night is clear and bright--it is no different from day! What should I undertake to do?" The general replied: "This night is clear and bright and no different from day: the thing to do would be to assemble the four-fold army and investigate into the matter of who is known to the world as obedient or rebellious."[52]

Then the king called to the *brāhmaṇa* Varṣakāra[53] and addressed him: "At this time of the full moon on the fifteenth, the night is clear and bright--it is no different from day! What *śramaṇa* or *brāhmaṇa* could I approach that would be able to enlighten my mind?" Varṣakāra replied: "This night is clear and bright and no different from day: there is one Pūraṇa Kāśyapa, in the midst of a great company as its leader, possessing much knowledge, of far-reaching fame, like the great ocean embracing much within him, supported by the offerings of the multitudes. Great King, you ought to go to him and pay your respects. If Your Majesty meets with him your mind will perhaps be enlightened."[54]

---

[51]Yung-chien ta-chiang 勇健大將. What I have translated as "courageous" may actually be the general's name.

[52] 宜集四兵案所天下知有逆順.

[53]Or perhaps simply Varṣa; the text has Yü-she p'o-lo'men 雨舍婆羅門. In the Pali Canon he is known as Vassakāra, but see our C3 below.

[54] 開悟. There is no need to assume that this implies Enlightenment in a fundamental or specifically Buddhist sense.

Then the king called to Varṣakāra's younger brother Sunidha and addressed him: "This night is clear and bright--it is no different from day! What śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa could I approach that would be able to enlighten my mind?" Sunidha replied: "This ight is clear and bright and no different from day: there is one Maskarin Gośālīputra, in the midst of a great company as its leader, possessing much knowledge, of far-reaching fame, like the great ocean embracing all within him, supported by the offerings of the multitudes. Great King, you ought to go to him and pay your respects. If Your Majesty meets with him, your mind will perhaps be enlightened."

Then the king called to the Grand Minister Tien-tso[55] and addressed him: "This night is clear and bright--it is no different from day! What śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa could I approach that would be able to enlighten my mind?" The Grand Minister Tien-tso replied: "There is one Ajita Keśakambalin, in the midst of a great company as its leader, possessing much knowledge, of far-reaching fame, like the great ocean embracing all within him, supported by the offerings of the multitudes. Great King, you ought to go to him and pay your respects. If Your Majesty meets with him, you mind will perhaps be enlightened."

Then the king called to Chia-lo Shou-men-chiang[56] and addressed him: "This night is clear and bright--it is no different from day! What śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa could I approach that would be able to enlighten

---

55 典作大臣

56 伽羅守門將 The last three characters are probably not part of the name, but mean "general in charge of guarding the gate". The first two characters point to Kāra, Kāla, or something similar.

my mind?" Chia-lo Shou-men-chiang replied: "There is one Kakuda Kātyāyana, in the midst of a great company as its leader, possessing much knowledge, of far-reaching fame, like the great ocean embracing all within him, supported by the offerings of the multitudes. Great King, you ought to go to him and pay your respects. If Your Majesty meets with him, your mind will perhaps be enlightened."

Then the king called to Yu-t'o-i Man-t'i-tzu[57] and addressed him: "This night is clear and bright--it is no different from day! What śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa could I approach that would be able to enlighten my mind?" Yu-t'o-i replied: "There is one Sañjayin Vairatīputra, in the midst of a great company as its leader, possessing much knowledge, of far-reaching fame, like the great ocean embracing all within him, supported by the offerings of the multitudes. Great King, you ought to go to him and pay your respects. If Your Majesty meets with him your mind will perhaps be enlightened."

Then the king called to his younger brother Abhaya and addressed him: "This night is clear and bright--it is no different from day! What śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa could I approach that would be able to enlighten my mind?" His younger brother Abhaya replied: "There is one Nirgrantha Jñātiputra, in the midst of a great company as its leader, possessing much knowledge, of far-reaching fame, like the great ocean embracing all within him, supported by the offerings of the multitudes. Great

---

57 優陀夷漫提子 The first three characters point to Udāyi; but of individuals mentioned in the Pali literature the most appropriate here seems to be Upaka Maṇḍikāputta. See, e.g., AN II, 181ff.

King, you ought to go to him and pay your respects. If Your Majesty meets with him, your mind will perhaps be enlightened."

Then the king called to Jīvaka Kumāra and addressed him: "This night is clear and bright--it is no different from day! What śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa could I approach that would be able to enlighten my mind?" Jīvaka Kumāra replied: "The Buddha, the World Honoured One, is presently residing in my āmra grove. Great King, you ought to go to him and pay your respects. If Your Majesty meets with him, your mind will certainly be enlightened." The king commanded Jīvaka: "Adorn the jewelled elephant that I ride, as well as five hundred white elephants." Jīvaka complied, and at once adorned the king's elephant as well as the five hundred elephants. When he had finished he said to the king: "The adorned mounts are ready; I await your orders."[58]

The king Ajātaśatru himself rode the jewelled elephant and had five hundred of his ladies ride the five hundred cow elehpants. In her hand each of the women held a torch, thus manifesting the awesome majesty of the king, and they went forth from Rājagṛha intending to go to the place where the Buddha was. When they had advanced but a short way along the road, [the king] addressed Jīvaka: "You are deceiving me; you are betraying me to an ambush; you are leading on my great company, intending to deliver us to our enemies." Jīvaka

---

[58] 嚴我所乘寶象及餘五百白象，耆舊受教即嚴王象及五百象訖白王言嚴駕已備唯願知時.
It seems likely that the adjective "white" (白) owes its existence to an error in the Chinese text. The elephants are not called white in any other version, nor anywhere else in this version, and there is ample room for confusion in the above passage (with both the characters 百 and 白).

replied: "Great King, I would not dare to deceive Your Majesty; I would not dare to betray you to an ambush, or to lead on Your Majesty's great company so as to deliver you to your enemies. Let Your Majesty only advance further, and you will certainly obtain great felicity." When the king had again advanced a little way he addressed Jīvaka: "You are cheating and deceiving me; you are betraying me to an ambush; you intend to lead on my company, then seize us and deliver us to our enemies." So spoke the king a second and again a third time. "And for what reason [do I have these fears]? Yonder is a great company of twelve hundred and fifty men--yet there is complete serenity without the slightest sound, and hence there must be a plot." And Jīvaka replied again a second and a third time: "Great King, I would not dare to cheat and deceive you, to betray you to an ambush, or to lead on Your Majesty's great company, seizing you and delivering you to your enemies. Let Your Majesty only advance further, and you will certainly obtain great felicity. And for what reason [is there this silence]? It is the rule with these śramaṇas always to delight in self-control and tranquility, and it is for this reason that there is no sound. Let Your Majesty only advance further: the grove is already in sight."

When the king Ajātaśatru reached the gateway to the grove, he descended from his elephant, took off his sword, discarded his umbrella, put from him the five items of majestic deportment,[59] and

---

[59]The list varies a bit from place to place, but it most commonly consists of: fan (or whisk), turban, sword, canopy, sandals (or slippers). In Pali these occur as: vāḷavījanī, uṇhīsa, khagga, chatta, pāduka (or upāhana). This list is apparently rather rare in the Pali Canon but is common in the Chinese āgamas. See PTSD s.v. pañca-kakudhabhaṇḍaṃ, and below, pp. 142-143.

entered the gateway to the grove on foot. He addressed Jīvaka: "Where, then, is the Buddha, the World Honoured One?" Jīvaka said in reply: "Great King, the Buddha is in the upper part of the elevated Hall--in fron there is a bright lamp. The World Honoured One is to be found on the Lion Seat, sitting with his face to the South. Let Your Majesty advance a short way and see the World Honoured One for himself."

Then the king Ajātaśatru went to the Discussion Hall. Outside he washed his feet, and only then ascended the Hall. Silently he looked all around, his heart filling with joy, and he broke out: "These śramaṇas are serenely still and quiet, their peace is perfect;[60] would that my eldest son Udāyi could attain to peace such as this!"[61]

Then the World Honoured One addressed the king Ajātaśatru: "You have thought of your son, and hence have broken out: 'Would that my eldest son Udāyi could attain to peace such as this!' Please come forward and be seated." The king Ajātaśatru came forward, honoured the Buddha's feet with his head and face, and sat down to one side, addressing the Buddha: "I would like to ask a question. If it is

---

[60] 止觀具足. The expression 止觀 is frequently used as a technical term for the meditational processes of śamatha and vipaśyanā, that is, stilling of the mind and contemplation. But I doubt whether the king wants his son to be an adept in śamatha and vipaśyanā. Although meditation may be implied, it seems likely that the term is used here simply to mean "tranquility, peace". 止觀具足 (and the later 止觀成就) may well correspond to the Pali "upasamena... samannāgato" (DN I, 50), which means "endowed with (or perfected in) tranquility".

[61] The text here is apparently very close to P, so I have consciously adopted some of Rhys Davids' wording (Dialogues, I, 68).

convenient, I shall venture to ask it." The Buddha said: "Great King, whoever wishes to ask a question, let him ask directly."

The king Ajātaśatru addressed the Buddha: "World Honoured One, where it is a matter of men riding elephants, horses, and chariots, and practicing the military arts of fighting with swords, lances, double-edged swords, bows and arrows and such weapons; or where it is a matter of kings' sons, strong officers, great strong officers, servants, leather-workers, barbers, garland-weavers, chariot-makers, potters, workers in bamboo and workers in reeds--they all depend on these various skills to maintain their lives and to give them pleasure. Father and mother, wife and children, slaves and servants share in this pleasure. In this manner they make a living, and there is present and visible resultant fruit and reward. Does, then, the activity of śramaṇas here and now, gain present and visible resultant fruit and reward or not?"[62]

The Buddha addressed the king: "Have you ever gone to the various śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas and asked after this fasion?"

The king said to the Buddha: "I have gone to the various śramaṇas and brāhmanas and asked after this fasion. I recall going on one occasion to Pūraṇa Kāśyapa and asking: 'Where it is a matter of men riding elephants, horses and chariots, or practicing the arts of weaponry'--and so on, including the various manners of gaining a living--'there is present and visible resultant fruit and reward. Does, then, the religious activity, here and now, of this assembly

---

[62] 今諸沙門現在所修現得果報不.

gain present and visible resultant fruit and reward or not?' This Pūraṇa Kāśyapa replied to me thus:

'If, Your Majesty,[63] one were himself to act or have others to act, to cut up, destroy, cook, hack up, vex and stir up living beings, so that they grieved and wept; to kill the living, steal, indulge in sensual pleasures, speak falsely, leap walls, plunder, set on fire, burn down, commit highway robbery, and thus do evil: Great King, engaging in this type of activity would not in fact constitute evil. Great King, if one were to slice up all beings with a sharp sword so as to make a heap of flesh that filled the entire world, this would not constitute evil, nor would it bring punitive retribution. To slice up beings to the south of the Ganges would not involve evil retribution; to bring together all beings and make gifts to them on the north shore of the Ganges, to the profit of humans and non-humans--such profiting would likewise involve no good recompense.'"

The king said to the Buddha: "As if there were a person who asked about a melon and was answered in terms of a plum, or, asking about a plum, was answered in terms of a melon--so it was with him. I asked if there was present and visible gaining of reward, and he answered with [his theory of] no bad or good retribution. Then I thought to myself: 'I am a Kṣatriya king, of the water-anointed caste.[64]

---

[63] 王若自作若教人作 etc. It is not certain that 王 (king) is vocative and, indeed, we would prefer 大王 (great king) if the king is being addressed. Hence 王 may be the subject of what follows ("If Your Majesty were himself to act or to have others act", etc.).

[64] 我是刹利王水澆頭種 The corresponding Pali terms are: *rāja*, *khattiya*, *muddhāvasitta*. See, for example, MN I, 231.

If without cause I were to slay one who had gone forth from home, or bind and banish him, I would feel anger and discontent.' After thinking thus I at once abandoned him and went away."

He further said to the Buddha: "On one occasion I went to Maskarin Gośālīputra and asked: 'Where it is a matter of men riding elephants, horses and chariots, or practicing the arts of weaponry'--and so on, including the various manners of gaining a living--'there is present and visible fruit and reward. Does, then, the religious activity, here and now, of this assembly gain present and visible resultant reward or not?' He replied to me thus:

'Great King, there is no such phenomenon as offering, or giving, or sacrificing; nor are there good and evil and the recompense of good and evil. There is no present world and there is no subsequent world. There is no father and there is no mother. There are neither gods nor transformation-beings.[65] There are in the world no śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas of even and impartial conduct,[66] and again none who in their own person see and bear witness to the present and subsequent worlds

---

[65]The text reads: 無天無化無衆生 , meaning: "There are no gods, there is no transformation, and there are no living beings." The Three Editions text, however, deletes the last 無 , and this is much better, for 無化衆生 ("there are no transformation-beings") is supported by the Pali "natthi sattā opapātikā" and well as by the Tibetan "sems-can brdzus-te skye-ba med-do". Hence this reading has been followed.

[66]"Even and impartial conduct" translates 平等行 , which is clearly related to the Pali sammaggatā sammāpatipannā and Tibetan yaṅ-dag-par soṅ-ba yaṅ-dag-par źugs-pa in the corresponding passage in P and Tb. There is frequently evidence of a confusion of samyañc and sama in the Chinese translations, which is easy to understand since samyañc would be samma in Prakrit (in which many of the texts were transmitted).

and reveal [this knowledge] to others. All those who say that there are such are liars.'"

"World Honoured One, as if there were a person who asked about a melon and was answered in terms of a plum, or, asking about a plum, was answered in terms of a melon--so it was with him. I asked if there was present and visible gaining of reward, and he answered with his doctrine of non-existence.[67] Then I thought to myself: 'I am a Kṣatriya king, of the water-anointed caste. If without cause I were to slay one who had gone forth from home, or bind and banish him, I would feel anger and discontent.' After thinking thus I at once abandoned him and went away."

He further said to the Buddha: "On one occasion I went to Ajita Keśakambalin and asked: 'Greatly Virtuous One, where it is a matter of men riding elephants, horses and chariots, or practicing the arts of weaponry'--and so on, including the various manners of gaining a living--'there is present and visible fruit and reward. Does, then, the religious activity, here and now, of this assembly gain present and visible resultant reward or not?' He replied to me thus:

---

[67] 彼以無答 This could be translated as "he answered with nonsense (無義)." We notice, however, that the concluding statement of the king in describing his visits to each of the heretics usually refers to the actual doctrine of the heretic in question; in the present case, the chief characteristic of the doctrinal statement is the frequent use of 無 ("there is not" or "there does not exist"). This receives support from C3 (彼報曰無也: "he answered: 'there does not exist'") and from the Tibetan ma mchis-ba ñid luṅ-bston-par bgyid (Rockhill: "[he] talked to me about not being"--*Life*, p. 101.)

'When a person containing the four elements comes to life's end, the earth element returns to earth, the water returns to water, the fire returns to fire, the wind returns to wind. Everyone is thus destroyed. The sense faculties return to space. At the time when a man dies the body is raised on the litter and disposed of in the graveyard. The fire burns his bones the color of pigeons,[68] or turns them to ashes. Whether foolish or wise, when they come to life's end all are destroyed, as phenomena subject to cutting off and annihilation.'

"World Honoured One, as if there were a person who asked about a melon and was answered in terms of a plum, or, asking about a plum, was answered in terms of a melon--so it was with him. I asked if there was present and visible gaining of reward, and he answered me with [his theory of] cutting off and annihilation. Then I thought to myself: 'I am a Kṣatriya king, of the water-anointed caste. If without cause I were to slay one who had gone forth from home, or bind and banish him, I would feel anger and discontent.' After thinking thus I at once abandoned him and went away."

He further said to the Buddha: "Formerly on one occasion I went to Kakuda Kātyāyana and asked: 'Greatly Virtuous One, where it is a matter of men riding elephants, horses and chariots, or practicing the arts of weaponry'--and so on, including the various manners of gaining a living--'there is present and visible fruit and reward. Does

---

68 鴿色 This corresponds to the Pali kāpotaka and the Tibetan thi-bai mdog in the parallel passages. The Indian term attempts to convey the impression of a dull white or grey color.

then, the religious activity, here and now, of this assembly gain present and visible resultant reward or not?' He replied to me thus:

"'Great King, there is no power and there is no energy; people have neither power nor resource. Without cause or condition beings become polluted, and without cause or occasion beings become pure. All beings, all creatures whatsoever that have life, are powerless and incapable of independent existence. There is no unjust recompense: it is settled by Fate. In the six types of birth one undergoes all pain and pleasure.'

"As if there were a person who asked about a melon and was answered in terms of a plum, or, asking about a plum, was answered in terms of a melon--so it was with him. I asked if there was present and visible gaining of reward, and he answered me with [his theory of] powerlessness. Then I thought to myself: 'I am a Kṣatriya king, of the water-anointed caste. If without cause I were to slay one who had gone forth from hom, or bind and banish him, I would feel anger and discontent.' After thinking thus I at once abandoned him and went away."

He further said to the Buddha: "Formerly on one occasion I went to Sañjayin Vairaṭīputra and asked: 'Greatly Virtuous One, where it is a matter of men riding elephants, horses and chariots, or practicing the arts of weaponry'--and so on, including the various manners of gaining a living--'there is present and visible fruit and reward. Does, then, the religious activity, here and now, of this assembly gain present and visible resultant reward or not?' He replied to me thus:

"'Great King, if asked: "Is there present and visible resultant fruit and reward for the <u>śramaṇa</u>'s life?" I would reply to the matter as follows: "As for this matter, it is factual; this matter is otherwise. This matter is not otherwise and not not otherwise." Great King, if asked: "Is there no present and visible resultant fruit and reward for the <u>śramaṇa</u>'s life?" I would reply to the matter as follows: "As for this matter, it is factual; this matter is otherwise. This matter is not otherwise and not not otherwise." Great King, if asked "Does there both exist and not exist present and visible resultant fruit and reward for the <u>śramaṇa</u>'s life?" I would reply to the matter as follows: "As for this matter, it is factual; this matter is otherwise. This matter is not otherwise and not not otherwise." Great King, if asked: "Does there neither exist nor not exist present and visible resultant fruit and reward for the <u>śramaṇa</u>'s life?" I would reply to the matter as follows: "As for this matter, it is factual; this matter is otherwise. This matter is not otherwise and not not otherwise."'

"World Honoured One, as if there were a person who asked about a melon and was answered in terms of a plum, or, asking about a plum, was answered in terms of a melon--so it was with him. I asked if there was present and visible gaining of reward, and he answered me in terms of a discussion of 'otherwise'.[69] Then I thought to myself: 'I am a Kṣatriya king, of the water-anointed caste. If without cause

---

69 彼異論答我 The 異 in this discussion seems to correspond to the Pali <u>aññathā</u>.

I were to slay one who had gone forth from home, or bind and banish him, I would feel anger and discontent.' After thinking thus I at once abandoned him and went away."

He further said to the Buddha: "Formerly on one occasion I went to Nirgrantha Jñātiputra and asked: 'Greatly Virtuous One, where it is a matter of men riding elephants, horses and chariots, or practicing the arts of weaponry'--and so on, including the various manners of gaining a living--'there is present and visible fruit and reward. Does, then, the religious activity, here and now, of this assembly gain present and visible resultant reward or not?' He replied to me thus:

"'Great King, I am a person all-knowing and all-seeing. I know everything without exception. Whether moving or staying, reclining or awake, this perfect knowledge is ever present before me.'

"World Honoured One, as if there were a person who asked about a melon and was answered in terms of a plum, or, asking about a plum, was answered in terms of a melon--so it was with him. I asked if there was present and visible gaining of reward, and he answered me in terms of all-knowledge. Then I thought to myself: 'I am a Kṣatriya king, of the water-anointed caste. If without cause I were to slay one who had gone forth from home, or bind and banish him, I would feel anger and discontent.' After thinking thus I at once abandoned him and went away.

"Hence, World Honoured One, I have now come here to enquire about this matter. Where it is a matter of men riding elephants, horses and chariots, or practicing the arts of weaponry--and so on, including the various manners of gaining a living--there is present

and visible fruit and reward. Does, then, the religious activity, here and now, of this assembly gain present and visible resultant reward or not?"

The Buddha addressed the king Ajātaśatru: "Now I am going to ask Your Majesty a question. You may answer as you wish. What do you think, Great King: suppose the servants of the Royal household --those working without and within--all saw Your Majesty, on the fifteenth day at the time of the full moon, wash your hair, bathe, and together with your maidens disport and take delight in your high palace. They might think thus: 'Well! Does then the fruit and recompense of action reach even to this? This king Ajātaśatru, on the fifteenth day at the time of the full moon, having washed his hair and bathed, together with all his maidens is disporting himself with the five desires in his high palace. Who could understand this? Yet it is the result of action.' They at a later time might cut off hair and beard, don the three Law-clothes, go forth from home, practise religion, and carry out the Impartial Law.[70] What do you think, Great King: if Your Majesty saw these people coming from a distance would you really still think: 'These are my servants?'"

The king said to the Buddha: "Not so, World Honoured One. If I saw them coming I would rise, welcome them, and beg them be seated."

The Buddha said: "Is this not a case of the Śramaṇa obtaining recompense in the present?"

---

[70] 平等法 I do not know what Indian term lies behind this expression. But see below, p.171, n. 110.

The king said: "Even so, World Honoured One. This is a case where the life of a śramaṇa gains present and visible reward."

"And again, Great King. Suppose that within Your Majesty's borders there were a man living in dependence on you, relying for food upon the Royal dole, and suppose that he saw Your Majesty on the fifteenth day at the time of the full moon, having washed your hair and bathed, together with your maidens disporting yourself with the five desires in your high palace. He might think thus: 'Well! Does then the fruit and recompense of action reach even to this? Who could understand this? Yet it is the result of action.' He at a later time might cut off hair and beard, don the three Law-clothes, go forth from home, practice religion, and carry out the Impartial Law. What do you think, Great King: if Your Majesty saw this man coming from a distance would you really still think: 'This is my retainer who eats of my dole?'"

The king said: "Not so. If I saw him coming from afar I would rise, greet him, pay him courteous respect, ask about him, and beg him be seated."

"What do you think, Great King: is this not a case of the śramaṇa obtaining resultant fruit and reward in the present?"

The king said: "Even so. This is a case where the life of a śramaṇa gains present and visible reward."

"And again, Great King: a Thus Come, enlightened with the most true and thoroughly genuine enlightenment, has made his appearance in the world. One who enters my Law "--and so on up to--" the

Three Insights,[71] putting an end to the Obfuscations,[72] and developing the great knowledge and insight that is called the verifying knowledge of the destruction of the Outflows. And why [does he have these attainments]? All this comes from spirited zeal and single-minded attention without lapse, from delighting only in quietude and not giving way to laxness. What do you think, Great King: is this not a case of the śramaṇa obtaining resultant fruit and reward in the present?"

The king replied: "Even so, World Honoured One. Such is in truth the resultant fruit and reward, here and now, of the life of a śramaṇa."

Then the king Ajātaśatru rose from his seat, honoured the Buddha's feet with his head and face, and said to the Buddha: "I pray the World Honoured One accept my repentance of error: I was wild and foolish, crazy, ignorant and senseless. My father the king of Magadha, Bimbisāra, ruled by Dharma--without partiality and injustice--

---

71 入我法者乃至三. The 乃至 is here, as frequently in Chinese Buddhist texts, the sign of ellipsis ("and so on, up to"), frequently corresponding to Pali pe, peyyālaṃ, Buddhist Sanskrit peyālaṃ. In this case we are apparently to refer to the passage found in the A-mo-chou ching 阿摩晝經 (=Pali Ambaṭṭha Sutta) found earlier in the Dīrgha (See T.I: vol. 1, pp. 83-86).

The Three Insights are (1) the knowledge of one's previous births, (2) the knowledge of the birth and rebirth, rise and fall, of other beings in accordance with their moral actions, (3) the knowledge of the destruction of the Outflows. See, for example, the passage just referred to in the A-mo-chou ching.

72 闇冥 Elsewhere in the Dīrgha referred to as 癡冥. This may refer to the āvaraṇas or nīvaraṇas.

yet, in truth, led astray by the five desires I killed my father the king. I pray the World Honoured One extend his pity and compassion, and mercifully accept my repentance of error."

The Buddha addressed the king: "You were foolish, ignorant and senseless, but you repent your error. You were led astray by the five desires and killed your father the king. Now in the Law of the Noble, one who is able to repent his error is seen as acting to his welfare and profit. I have pity on you and accept your repentance of error."

Then the king Ajātaśatru, after he had honoured the feet of the World Honoured One, went back and sat to one side. The Buddha discoursed to him on Dharma, teaching him, profiting and delighting him. When the king had listened to the Buddha's teaching he spoke to the Buddha: "I take refuge in the Buddha, refuge in the Dharma, and refuge in the Saṅgha. Receive me into the Good Law as an upāsaka. From this day forth as long as life endures I will not kill, steal, give way to sensuality, speak falsely, or drink liquor.[73] I pray that the World Honoured One, together with this whole great assembly, accept my invitation [to tomorrow's meal]." Then the World Honoured One by his silence gave his assent. When the king saw that the Buddha had by his silence accepted the invitation, he arose, paid his respect to the Buddha, encircled him three times, and returned homeward. A short time after he had left, the Buddha addressed the bhikṣus: "As to this king Ajātaśatru, his transgression is diminished; he has

---

[73]These are the five moralities (pañcaśīlāni) of the layman.

removed a weighty offense. If the king Ajātaśatru had not killed his father he would have on this very seat obtained the purity of the dharma-eye; nevertheless, in as much as the king Ajātaśatru has now repented his error, his transgression is diminished and he has removed a weighty offense."

When the king Ajātaśatru had reached midway he addressed Jīvaka: "Excellent! Excellent! You have herein done me much profit and good. First you praised the Thus Come as to his ability to open the intelligence through teaching, and now you have led me to the World Honoured One, where I have indeed been enlightened. I am deeply aware of your kindness and will never forget it."

Then the king returned to his palace and managed the preparation of all delicacies and every sort of food and drink. On the following day when the time had arrived [he said]: "May the Noble One know it is time."[74] At that time the World Honoured One dressed, took up his bowl, and together with his company of twelve hundred and fifty disciples went to the king's palace, proceeded to a seat, and sat down. Then the king with his own hands served food to the Buddha and the Saṅgha. When they were finished eating and had put aside their bowls and washed, [the king] honoured the feet of the World Honoured One and said: "I now a second and third time repent my error: I was wild and foolish, crazy, ignorant and senseless. My father the king of Magadha, Bimbisāra, ruled by Dharma--without

---

[74]The text reads: 明日時到唯聖知時, lit. "the next day when the time arrived only the noble knew." I have assumed an omission in the text.

partiality and injustice--yet, in truth, led astray by the five desires I killed my father the king. I pray the World Honoured One extend his pity and compassion, and mercifully accept my repentance of error."

The Buddha addressed the king: "You were foolish, ignorant and senseless,and, led astray by the five desires, killed your father the king. Now in the Law of the Noble, one who is able to repent his error is seen as acting to his welfare and profit. I have pity on you and accept your repentance of error."

Then, when the king had honoured the Buddha's feet, he took a low seat and sat before him. The Buddha discoursed to him on Dharma, teaching him, profiting and delighting him. When the king had listened to the Buddha's teaching he again addressed him: "I now a second and a third time take refuge in the Buddha, refuge in the Dharma, and refuge in the Saṅgha. I pray that you receive me into the Good Law as an upāsaka. From this day forth as long as life endures I will not kill, steal, give way to sensuality, speak falsely, or drink liquor. Then, when the World Honoured One had discoursed to the king Ajātaśatru on Dharma, teaching, profiting and delighting him, he arose from his seat and took his leave. And when the king Ajātaśatru and Jīvaka Kumāra had heard what the Buddha had spoken, they rejoiced and did his bidding.

The Fruits of the Life of a Samaṇa (C2)[75]

Thus have I heard. On one occasion the Buddha was sojourning in the city of Rājagṛha, in the plum orchard of Jīvaka, together with a company of twelve hundred and fifty bhikṣus.

At that time the king Ajātaśatru, on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, was passing the day of celebration of the end of the summer retreat and the beginning of the new year,[76] together with his ministers and officials and surrounded by his retinue. He looked around in utmost peace and quiet and addressed his ministers: "Consider, Good Sirs: in view of what I am here doing it is not the time for persevering in melancholy; nevertheless, despite this new year I am unseasonably filled with anxiety. With what expedient can I dispel this dread?"

One of the ministers said to the king: "You ought to disperse your worries by means of the five pleasures."

One of the ministers [said]: "You ought to engage famed performers to play music and sing with wonderful dexterity and exceptional skill. In this way you could relieve your worried mind."

One of the ministers said: "You might dispel your anxiety with the four kinds of fearless soldier--those on elephant and horse, in chariots and on foot."

---

[75]Chi-chih kuo ching, lit.: "The Fruits of the Life of One Intent on Tranquility." In this case the representation of chi-chih 寂志 as śramaṇa is misleading, so the Prakrit samaṇa has been used. See the discussion below, pp. 241-242.

[76]時王阿闍世七月十五日過新歲臘.

One of the ministers said: "All of the teachers--Pūraṇa Kāśyapa, Maskarin Gośālīputra, Ajita Keśakambalin, Kakuda Kātyāyana, Sañjayin Vairaṭīputra, Nirgrantha Jñātiputra--each with a following of five hundred, are residing in this great city. You could have the royal mount made ready, and go and meet with them. When you have heard their conversation you will be delighted, and will be able to leave your troubles behind."

At that time there was a prince of children's doctors by the name of Jīvaka[77] who was standing in attendance on the king holding a fan. The king turned to him and said: "And why, Sir, are you silent, the only one who has suggested nothing?"

Jīvaka said to the king: "If you wish to alleviate your burning, forget your worries and get rid of your troubles: the Buddha, the World Honoured One, together with a company of disciples, is presently residing in my plum grove. You could go to where the Buddha is, bow your head and offer respect. When you humbly present to him your doubts and problems you will receive enlightenment."[78]

Immediately the king Ajātaśatru wished to see the god among gods.[79] He replied to Jīvaka: "Good! Most Excellent! You must make preparations that we may go and have audience with him."

---

[77]That is to say, Jīvaka was the chief among doctors of children. The text reads 時有童子醫王名曰耆域, which admits of several interpretations. The one given here has been chosen in light of the tradition that Jīvaka was in fact a doctor of children (see Rhys Davids' remarks, Dialogues, I, p. 65, n. 2).

[78]That is, "understanding" or "opening of the intelligence", 開解.

[79]天中之天.

Jīvaka, following these instructions, made ready five hundred elephants and five hundred court women. When the outfitting was completed, he informed the king that it was done, saying: "Now is the time." The king mounted his riding elephant named Jen-t'iao[80] and, together with five hundred attendants to guard the front and rear, went forth from the city of Rājagṛha, lighting a great blaze of torches.

Then the king became afraid; he stopped and would not advance. He said to Jīvaka: "The Buddha is residing in the plum grove with how many bhikṣus?"

"There are twelve hundred and fifty."

The king said: "I hope you are not deceiving me, having me leave the capital that I might meet with peril on the way? Whenever I have gone to the deluded men of heterodox persuasion,[81] where they had a company of five hundred men there was always a din being given off. Yet now these bhikṣus are many and I hear no sound."

Jīvaka said to the king: "Do not be afraid. Do not be alarmed. I would never dare plot against Your Majesty, nor treacherously bring

---

[80] 仁調 The meaning of this name would be "kind and well-trained", or perhaps "humanely trained." The elephant's name is not mentioned elsewhere.

[81] The text reads: 每至異道諸惑志所. We may take it that 惑志, "deluded minds", is in deliberate contrast to 寂志, "peaceful minds" (or "intent on peace"), the latter being the translation of śramana (or more properly Prakrit samaṇa) used in this text. It is not clear what term 惑志 translates. The Three Editions text reads instead 梵志, but there is no convincing reason to adopt this reading.

your Queen and ladies to ruin. It is simply that the Buddha, the World Honoured One, has for a long time[82] been tranquil, while his disciples are bent on mastering the Law and are hence quiet. I pray Your Majesty advance and look upon the most wonderful radiance.[83] When you see the Buddha, the World Honoured One, and his company of disciples, your desires will be satisfied."

At this, the king Ajātaśatru looked toward[84] the World Honoured One from afar, then descended from his mount and put from him the five articles. He took off the royal head-dress, the fringed and jewelled clothing, the bouquet of feathers--variegated and of kingfisher plumes; he cast aside his canopy and put away his sword. On foot he proceeded to the Discussion Hall, and asked Jīvaka: "Where is the Buddha?"[85]

"The one who is sitting in front of the gathering of bhikṣus, that is he. How radiant his wondrous power! How lofty are his virtues!"[86]

---

[82] 長夜, lit. "long night" but used to translate Skt. dīrgharātram (also "long night" literally), which means "for a long time."

[83] 願王前覲上妙光明 Presumably reference here is to the radiance of the Buddha, but this is not made explicit.

[84] Lit. "saw" (見) but this fits poorly with what follows.

[85] The text reads 佛為所在, which is not a question and makes little sense. It may be that some such reading as 佛為何所在 or 佛何所在 is original.

[86] 威神光光功德巍巍.

The king advanced to the Buddha, asked politely about him, respectfully faced him and then stood to one side. He surveyed the Buddha and the assembly of bhiksus, all sitting in peace and tranquility,[87] infinitely pure and deep beyond comprehension. His heart delighted,[88] he extended his folded hands toward the Buddha and addressed the World Honoured One: "The Buddha's mind is tranquil, and wondrously free of [distracting] thoughts; his disciples are likewise. I pray you help my mind to be set on such wondrous stillness as this!"

There was a youth by the name of Po Hsien who said to the king: "Does Your Majesty desire to have such conduct?"[89]

The king said to the Buddha: "Truly, World Honoured One, I wish to enjoy such joy of heart as this assembly of monks."[90]

Then the king Ajātaśatru said to the Buddha: "I wish to inquire about something: if you would deign to listen I share dare to speak."

The Buddha said: "Ask at once concerning what is on your mind."

---

[87] 悉坐寂定 This could be read as "all seated in peaceful meditation", but in view of the use of 寂 and 定 in this passage, and in light of parallel passages in the other texts, I believe the translation given is correct.

[88] Possibly, "Their hearts delighted," referring to the monks.

[89] 有一童子名曰帛賢白其王言大王願欲得是行耶 . This is very peculiar in light of the other versions. It does seem likely, however, that 帛賢 ("Wealth Honoured One") stands for Udaya Bhadra (taking Udaya as "gain, profit").

[90] The translation is rather free. The text has: 願樂衆僧其心歡悅, "I wish to take delight in (or to delight) the assembly of monks; their hearts are joyful."

The king said:[91] "[Possessing] whatever can be supplied and everything that can be desired, such as pleasure and sleep; assembling disputants and mathematicians, officially appointed chief ministers, the myriad minor officials, astrologers and soothsayers [who] know the beginning and end of man; receiving the respect of others as well as their food, drink and skill--perhaps for [my] own person or for father and mother, wife and children, male and female slaves--[I thus] am able to make offering to <u>śramaṇas</u> and <u>brāhmaṇas</u>, giving to them with the highest service and thereby seeking the advantages of tranquility and good fortune. Have [I] thereby accomplished anything in this Buddhist religious system and attained to the experience of religious truth or not?"[92]

The Buddha said: "Has Your Majesty ever asked the various heretics about this matter?"

The king said to the Buddha: "I once went to Pūraṇa Kāśyapa and asked: 'Possessing elephants and horses, chariot-riders and foot-soldiers, wealth and treasure, followers, boxes and receptacles, hardy soldiers brave and fierce, great elephants, carriages and horses,

---

[91] The question the king puts to the Buddha is difficult in many respects and is largely without parallel in our other texts. It is also confusing to have the form of the question change to a greater or lesser degree whenever the king approaches someone new. In the present case the first person "I" has been supplied on the strength of the 我 found in the adjacent passage describing his question to Pūraṇa Kāśyapa.

[92] 頗有立於是佛法律得道澄不乎.
"Religious system" translates 法律, "doctrine and discipline," which may stand for <u>dharmavinaya</u> in the original.

pleasure and sleep; assembling gods and men, officially appointed chief ministers, the myriad minor officials, astrologers and soothsayers [who] know the beginning and end of man, one has something worthy of respect and something that one has accomplished. Perhaps for my own sake I seek peace and tranquility or perhaps for the sake of father and mother, wife and children, male and female slaves. I make offering to śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas giving to them with the highest service: shall I really in this way attain to the realization of the end of this religious system, and enter the path of peace?'[93]

"And he replied to me, saying: 'There is no such thing. Nor is there any World Honoured One. There is no recompense for goodness or kindness, nor are there good and sinful works. There is no father and no mother. Nor are there any arhats or men who have attained the Way. All offering is without good recompense. There is neither a present world nor a future world, nor is there anyone single-mindedly intent in his pursuit of the Way. Therefore, although there is corporeal life, after life is over the four items scatter in destruction. The mind is extinguished and returns to nothingness, and one is not born again. Though one is buried in a tomb, each [element] is lost to corruption. All are gone, like empty space. There is nothing to be reborn.'

"Truly, World Honoured One, having put a question to this unorthodox teacher and having been answered like this I thought:

---

[93]是我寧得法律之正入寂然道乎.

'No! How could there be no recompense for good and evil?'[94] As if there were someone who asked what sort of thing a plum was, and he were answered in terms of a melon, or, asking about a melon were answered in terms of a plum. Pūraṇa Kāśyapa was just so. His words were topsy-turvy and without logical order. Although I had heard his discourse my problem was not solved."

The king Ajātaśatru said to the Buddha: "I went on to Maskarin Gośālīputra and asked: 'What is meant by the low stage, the stage of desire?'[95]

"[He replied]:[96] 'Men become pure without cause or condition. Whether they are men of good or bad works or not, there is no knowing and no seeing.' He further answered me: 'There is neither a present

---

[94] 我心念言無云何而無罪福報應.

[95] 何謂小處欲處 This question is repeated with variations in the encounters with the rest of the heretics. I am not at all certain I understand it. I have interpreted 小 ("small") as "petty, mean, low." The term 處 ("place") can translate many different terms. It would seem here to mean "stage, destiny, realm" (like *bhūmi*, or *gati*). This receives support from the passage where the king asks Kakuda Kātyāyana the origin (or cause) of rebirth as an animal (畜生所由). In light of the reference just cited I have also taken 欲處 to be a bad rather than a good thing, although the standard technical expressions for realms of desire (*kāmadhātu*, *kāmaloka*, etc.) do not appear to be involved.

In short, it seems that the king, having killed his father and being in some dread on this account, and more particularly being concerned about his rebirth (see the final section of this version), is anxious to know the effect of action on his destiny.

[96] There is no verb of quotation and it may be that this section (up to "he further answered") belongs to the king's speech. This, however, makes an already difficult passage virtually unintelligible.

In my translation of these lines I assume that the *Taishō* punctuation is wrong.

world nor a future world. There is neither power nor is there not power. There is no energy. All men receive their suffering and pleasure.' "It was as if, asking about six, one were answered in terms of seven. World Honoured One, it was as if, asking about a plum, one were answered in terms of a melon, or asking about a melon were answered in terms of a plum. This heretic was just so. In my own state, inquiring as I did, I was answered like this. When I had heard what he said[97] I was not enlightened, and I immediately left him and went away.

"I went on to Ajita and asked: 'What is meant by the stage where one dwells, the stage of desire?[98] How in this religious system does one arrive at experience of the truth?'

"He answered me:[99] 'Truly, Your Majesty, someone else came and inquired and I replied: "If you were to say there is a next world and another birth I would interject saying that there was indeed a next world. Suppose there be a next world and another birth in the world, or that there is and is not: according to my view maybe there is a next world or maybe there is not a next world." Or if there were someone who came and inquired I would say: "Suppose there is a next world and suppose there is no next world. Maybe this exists and maybe it does not."'

---

[97]Reading 聞其所言 instead of 問其所言.

[98]何謂所住處欲處.云何於是法律得至道證.

[99]This speech is very difficult. The translation is tentative.

"As if a man asked about a plum and was answered in terms of a melon, or asking about a melon was answered in terms of a plum--Ajita was just so. I asked about the śramana gaining experience of the truth and he answered me by picking up these manifold aspects of his peculiar arts. His words were without order. I said to myself: 'All the heretics in the city of Rājagṛha are unable to enlighten me and get rid of my sorrowful thoughts. Where shall I find a śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa who can set my mind at ease and cause it to cease from worry?' When I saw that what Ajita said was of no help I rose at once and went away.

"I went on to Kakuda Kātyāyana and asked: 'What is meant by the stage where one dwells? I beg to ask the source of rebirth as an animal. In this religious system how does one attain to experience of the truth?'

"He replied to me:[100] 'Truly, Your Majesty, as for the fact of men receiving a body, there is neither cause nor condition. Nor is there consciousness, nor is there [cause for] arrogance, nor accumulating of destructive deeds. One simply stands in his station and gets his abode. In this way he gets a body. There is no one who escapes this. When he has conceived something in his mind and it has come about that he has acted he calls this sin and merit, good and evil. As for that which has been cut in two by men and that which the eye has seen, there can be no dispute about them. One who when

---

[100] Of all the obscure passages in this version, the speech here put into the mouth of Kakuda Kātyāyana is the most profoundly dark. The translation offered here should be taken as giving merely an indication of the contents of the passage.

his life is finished does not mourn his death, does not give utterance to this desire: "Now that I must die I [hope to] reach to the [realms of] the gods or men." Therefore he will say simply: "My life is finished." In this human world of craving and desire, toil and filth, the [status of] gods and men is desired. As to that to which they wish to attain, there are five [stages of] robbery and sixty-two classes. As for the sixty-two classes, they have no actual class-nature. If one says that these sixty-two things are in conjunction with "class-nature"--there is no use thinking and pondering. When they enter the eight difficulties all is discarded and diminished; [from this point on] they will continually be augmented, till they then attain peace. Having attained peace they continually dwell in the abodes of the gods; having dwelt in the abodes of the gods there are then the eighty-four great Considerations, where they will be with magic and with the mysterious. Then there will arise in them the pains of old age and sickness.

"'There are no "men of the Way" nor are there "brāhmaṇas." As to those who speak thus: "Our discipline is pure and we have transcended all passion and desire--as to desire, we have completely finished with it": they continually follow what their body [dictates] like a burning lamp that has already been lit.[101] Even so it is with them. There are none who have attained the Way, and no brāhmaṇas.'

"As if there were a man who asked about a plum and was answered in terms of a melon, or asking about a melon was answered in terms of

---

[101]Or: "that has finished burning."

a plum--this Kakuda Kātyāyana was just so. I asked about the śramaṇa attaining experience of the truth and he took up all [these matters of] old and sick people in order to answer me. I said to myself: 'Asking about experience of the truth, I have instead gotten this in reply.' When I had heard what he said I was not made happy and I was not thereby enlightened. So I at once got up and left.

"I went on to Sañjayin Vairaṭīputra and asked him: 'I would ask about the station where one dwells, the station of desire.[102] In this religious system how does one attain to the truth?'

"He replied to me as follows: 'Truly, Your Majesty, as to that which a man does or that which he causes others to do[103]--cutting off, taking away, being attached to looking at what he has seen,[104] satisfying his every urge, dispelling all [his] sadness and grief, smashing pots and jars, falling into avarice and greed, laying waste the walls of cities, destroying the populace, murdering and plundering, giving himself completely to debauchery, lying and deceiving, drinking liquor and going over to brawling and disorder--even though he commit these deeds there will be no punitive retribution. What he may give and distribute [on the other hand] brings no good reward. Causing

---

[102]The text has 問所住欲, lit. "I would ask about the desire in which one dwells." I take this to be corrupt.

[103]The Taishō punctuation is seriously wrong here.

[104]Since 離 as "to leave, separate from, transcend" seems to make little sense here, I have taken it in its two present occurrences as "to fall into, encounter, experience" (though it must be admitted that elsewhere in the text it has the former meaning).

destruction and acting rebelliously, committing a mass of bad deeds, has neither punishment nor reward, nor is anything received [in retribution]. What is done has neither cause nor condition. There is no perfect honesty and there is no moral restraint and purity; moral laxness and moral rigor as well as good and evil are without recompense.'

"As if, asking about a plum, one were answered in terms of a melon, or, asking about a melon, one were answered in terms of a plum. Sañjayin Vairaṭīputra was just so. Asking whether the practising of the Law would lead to experience of the truth I was answered in terms of 'cutting off' and 'there is no good or bad recompense.' I said to myself: 'Why is it so?' I was not thereby enlightened so I immediately left.

"I went on to Nirgrantha Jñātiputra and asked: 'Nirgrantha Jñātiputra, what is meant by attaining the stage where one dwells, the stage of desire? Are there men [who do so] or not?[105] In what sense are the good and bad recompense that we receive matters that pertain to a previous existence? Does one who studies the Way attain the Way or not?'

"He replied to me as follows: 'Truly, Your Majesty, as to everything that is seen by people in this present existence, the good and bad recompense that are received are entirely a matter pertaining to former existence. As a result of the cause and condition of craving and desire one is born; as a result of cause and condition there are old age and sickness. Hence one who studies the Way has

---

[105]何謂得所住處欲處有人無耶.

attention to causes and conditions. Therefore he causes the begetting of descendants first and only then attains the Way.'[106]

"As if, asking about a plum, one were answered in terms of a melon, or, asking about a melon, one were answered in terms of a plum. I asked about the attainment of experience of the truth and was answered instead with empty foolishness. When I heard what he had to say I was neither pleased nor delighted, but arose and went away."

The king Ajātaśatru said to the Buddha: "I have asked all the teachers and yet have not been enlightened. I venture to ask the World Honoured One the place where true wealth lies.[107] Truly, I hope that you will respond to my doubts with due regard for what I have asked. How does a *śramaṇa* or *brāhmaṇa* in this religious system reach and attain to personal experience of the truth?"

The Buddha addressed the king: "With regard to that about which you wish to inquire, I shall proceed to analyse one matter after another for you and release the bonds of your heart. But first I shall put a question to Your Majesty; Your Majesty may answer as you see fit. What do you think, Your Majesty: let us suppose there is a man who dresses you in fine clothing and waits upon you to give you pleasure and enjoyment.[108] And suppose this man is not happy

---

[106]於是學道有因緣想因生子孫然後得道. This would appear to be a clumsy attempt to parody the Jains.

[107]敢問世尊財寶所在處.

[108]In light of what comes later we would prefer to read 好著 ("is skilled in dressing you"), although the passage would still be peculiar. The most natural reading is: "Suppose there is a man who wears fine clothing and waits upon Your Majesty in order to give himself pleasure." This, however, makes no sense in the context.

with the place where he is now living, nor with his native place. He thinks to himself: 'The king Ajātaśatru is a man; I too am a man. The king amuses himself with the five pleasures and adorns himself with clothing. [I] take no pleasure in my native place nor am I fond of the place where I am now living. I must establish merit and leave behind all sin and demerit. The best thing would be for me to get rid of hair and beard, put on the monk's garments and become a śramaṇa.' With the faith [acquired while living at] home he forsakes home and practices the Way, then takes on the precepts and carries out the religious prohibitions, refraining from killing, stealing and being unchaste, from lying and slander, vile speech and abusive talk, from anger, envy and foolishness. What does Your Majesty think? [Suppose someone][109] came to Your Majesty and reported: 'The man who was skillful at adornment and who served Your Majesty, not being pleased with where he was dwelling nor fond of his [native] place, with the faith [acquired while living at] home has abandoned home to practice the Way. He guards his body, mouth and thoughts, refrains from committing the myriad evils and carries out the ten good [practices]'. What then, Your Majesty?"

The king said to the Buddha: "If I were to see this man I would joyfully ask about him and politely pay him honour and respect. I would offer him clothing, food and drink, articles for sleeping and medicines for illness."

---

[109]This is supplied from other versions.

The Buddha said to the king: "This man would not yet have carried out the great principles nor attained the experience and fruit of the Way."

The king said to the Buddha: "I would receive his expounding of the Law."

The Buddha said to the king: "With respect to the world I am the Thus Come, the most truly, evenly and rightly Enlightened, with perfected comprehension and action; I am the Well Gone, understander of the world, man without peer, charioteer of the religious Law, teacher of gods and men, called the Buddha, the World Honoured One. I proceed to teach the Law, of which the beginning discourse is good, the middle discourse is good, the final discourse is good--in meaning and wisdom wondrously complete. I expound the pure course of conduct.

"Suppose a respected elder has a son: he hears the scripture preached by the Buddha and obtains faith that there is good profit in the religious system of the Thus Come. He perceives that in the Buddha's Law there is great good profit, attains receptivity to the Law,[110] and ponders: 'Remaining in the household life involves being oppressed by dirt and dust, whereas the one who has left home is free from all obstructions. For he unites his mind in suppressing and getting rid of desires and pleasures and for the remainder of his life practices the pure course of action.' He thinks to himself: 'I wish to abandon the wealth of my household and the relations with whom I share my

---

[110] 法忍.

dwelling, to discard hair and beard, put on the monk's garment and with the faith [acquired while living] at home go forth and follow the Way.' He relinquishes those things in which he delighted and makes firm his will on tranquility;[111] he obeys the two hundred and fifty prescriptions of the bhikṣu, does not transgress the religious restrictions, guards the rules of liberation,[112] practices the restraining precepts and is not amiss in the rules and restrictions. He gets rid of his possessions; he is quiet and respectful, fearful and cautious. With mind concentrated, level and even, he trains himself in the good precepts. He holds himself aloof from killing, and does not take up the sword or the stick[113] ....

....

having cut off birth and death, having attained the Brahma-conduct, having done what was to be done, knowing the origin of name and form."[114]

The Buddha said: "Your Majesty, this is the fruit, here and now, of the way of the śramaṇa."

---

[111]Reading with the Three Editions 寂志 instead of 家志

[112]護得度法. This refers to the Prātimokṣa, as does also the expression "the two hundred and fifty prescriptions of the bhikṣu."

[113]Here follows the long section on the moralities, meditations and supernatural attainments as found in the Pali (though of course with many differences in detail). We return to the text as the Buddha concludes his description of the man who has destroyed the Outflows (āsravas) and attained liberation.

[114]This corresponds to the Pali, khīṇā jāti vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ kataṃ karaṇīyaṃ nāparaṃ itthattāyā ti pajānāti. Could "name and form" (nāmarūpam) be the result of a corruption of nāparam?

At this, the king of Magadha, Ajātaśatru, rose from his seat and bowed his head to the Buddha's feet. Confessing his fault and repenting his error he said: "I pray that the World Honoured One pardon my crime. Like a little child I was stupid, dense and foolish; lost and deluded my mind went astray and I was completely without resourcefulness. The Buddha is the King of the Law and the father and mother of all.[115] He continually establishes the Good Law, rescuing those who have gone astray and establishing the Law; without wrath he destroys the darkness of their delusion.[116] Now, as to my future births, I pray the World Honoured One receive me as I turn to him for refuge with my whole life. I perceive my error and evil deeds; again I receive your admonishment. I would set right what is past and act obediently in the future."

The Buddha said: "Your Majesty: as Your Honour has said, you were indeed like a little child that, stupid, dense and foolish, lost, deluded and without resourcefulness, has put to death its parents.[117] Now you have gone for refuge to the King of the Law for the sake of your future births. When one perceives his transgression, in this religious system this is to his good profit rather than being to his detriment."

---

[115] 佛為法王，一切父母。

[116] 無怒害陰蓋 Presumably this is an attempt to augment the metaphor of the Buddha as the king of the Dharma, who slays "without wrath" delusion or obfuscation (probably āvaraṇa or nīvaraṇa).

[117] 父母, lit. "father and mother". The mention of "mother" is surprising.

Then the king Ajātaśatru folded his hands toward the Buddha [saying]: "Truly, I pray that the World Honoured One as well as the assembly of bhikṣus accept my offering [of a meal]."

Then when the Buddha had silently accepted the invitation and the king knew that his invitation had been accepted, his heart was overjoyed; he encircled the Buddha three times, bowed his head and took his leave.

When the king had left and while he was yet not far from the Buddha, he addressed Jīvaka Kumāra: "You have done me much profit and benefit by having me go to the Buddha to receive his instruction on the Law; having had audience with the World Honoured One I have been released from my sinful transgression and have had a weighty fault made light."

The Buddha addressed the bhikṣus: "The king Ajātaśatru has already attained the receptivity of ordinary beings.[118] Although he has killed a Law-king,[119] he has completely done away with the imperfections and impurities and is free from the Outflows. He is established in the Law and will not regress. On this very seat the eye for dharmas, which is far from dust and free of impurity, has arisen [in him]."

---

[118] 已得生忍.

[119] 法王. This is the same term as was earlier used of the Buddha, but the meaning is of course quite different. The Buddha is King of the Dharma, whereas Bimbisāra was simply an earthly king who ruled righteously, or in accord with Dharma.

The king returned to his palace and that night arranged the preparation of a hundred sorts of foods, delicacies and dainties. On the following morning he went to the place where the Buddha was, bowed his head to the Buddha's feet and addressed him: "The time has arrived; I beg you, Sir, to humble yourself."

The Buddha then, together with the bhikṣu Saṅgha and surrounded by a company, proceeded to the king's palace. When the Buddha and his company were seated and had performed the necessary washing, [the king] distributed the food, serving it with his own hands. When the eating and washing were finished, the king took a small bench and sat before the Buddha, listening to him expound the scriptures. The king said to the Buddha: "Truly, World Honoured One, I pray you accept my invitation to pass the entire summer [here]. In my palace in Rājagṛha I would supply to you, as well as to the assembly of bhikṣus, whatever you lack. I would for the Buddha erect five hundred vihāras, suitable for the repose and accommodation of twelve hundred and fifty men. Whatever grain there be in the granaries and whatever there be, large or small, in the inner palace, I would offer to you for your sustenance."

The Buddha said: "Your Majesty is pleased and happy, and hence what you give is abundant. But I have already accepted the summer's invitation of the elder Sudatta[120] of Śrāvastī!"

---

[120]Hsü-ta 須達. This is the famous Buddhist layman Anāthapiṇḍaka.

The king addressed the Buddha: "The elder of that capital will gain profit because the Buddha, the god among gods, has first accepted his invitation."

Then the Buddha discoursed on the Law for Ajātaśatru the king, causing his mind to be enlightened. The Buddha spoke the following gāthā:[121]

Of those who offer sacrifice with fire,
Each has that which he names the highest:[122]

The king is the most honoured among men,
The ocean the source of the myriad streams;

Among the stars the moon is bright,
And the sun in the day lets fall its rays.

Of whatever comes and goes above and beneath,
Whatever may be called "creatures",

In the heavens above and in this world,
The Way of the Buddha is most honoured.

When the Buddha had finished expounding scripture, the king Ajātaśatru and the assembly of bhikṣus, as well as gods and asuras, hearing the scripture were well pleased, paid their respects and took their leave.

---

[121]This gāthā is very common in Buddhist literature and occurs in a variety of contexts. See, for example, Sn, vv. 568, 569. It also occurs in the Chinese Ekottara: see T.125: vol. 2, pp. 589, 694. See also T.133: vol. 2, p. 856. For examples in the Vinaya literature see T.1421: vol. 22, p. 2; T.1429: vol. 22, p. 1015 (T.1430: vol. 22, p. 1023 and T.1431: vol. 22, p. 1031). In the versions of the Śrāmaṇyphala it is found only here and in the Mūlasarvāstivādin version (see S).

[122]Or perhaps, "Those who offer sacrifice with fire all call [this sacrifice] the highest":有作火祠者一切自謂上. The Sanskrit (see S) has "agnihotramukhā yajñāh, sāvitrī cchandasām mukham," and this reading is supported in numerous other places (see above references). The C2 version appears here to be corrupt, and sarva ("all, every") seems to have been read in place of sāvitrī.

Faith Without Roots (C3)[123]

Thus have I heard. On one occasion the Buddha was staying at the city of Rājagṛha in Jīvaka's pear orchard, together with twelve hundred and fifty disciples. All were Arhats--with Outflows brought to an end and the six Discernments[124] clear and penetrating--save only one person, namely the bhikṣu Ānanda.

At that time the king Ajātaśatru, on the fifteenth day of the seventh month at the time of Shou-sui,[125] at midnight when the bright stars were appearing,[126] addressed his lady Yüeh-kuang:[127] "On this the fifteenth day the moon is perfectly full and surpassingly clear and bright. What should we undertake to do?"

His lady replied: "On this the fifteenth day, the day of the reciting of the discipline,[128] we should engage in dance and song and with the five desires give ourselves to pleasure."

Now when the king had heard these words he did not take them to his heart, but went on to address the Crown Prince Udāyi: "The night is surpassingly clear and bright. What should we do?"

---

[123] Wu-ken hsin.

[124] 六通. The six abhijñā.

[125] 受歲時. The end of the summer retreat.

[126] 明星出現. 明星 can also mean the Evening Star, Venus.

[127] 月光夫人: "lady Moonlight." The Taishō editors (T.1: vol. 1, p. 762, n. 8) identify this name as Komudī (see P), which is an excellent hypothesis but not entirely certain.

[128] 戒, which here refers to the Prātimokṣa.

The Crown Prince Udāyi said to the king: "Inasmuch as this mid-night is surpassingly clear and bright, we ought to assemble the four-fold army and go and make attack upon all those foreign enemy states that have not yet been crushed."

When the king Ajātaśatru had heard these words they again did not strike him as good, and he went on to address the Crown Prince Abhaya:[129] "As this night is surpassingly clear and bright, what should we undertake to do?"

Prince Abhaya replied: "Pūraṇa Kāśyapa comprehends every manner of calculation, as well as understanding both astronomy and geography;[130] he is honoured of the multitudes. You could go to him and state your problem. This man will certainly speak to you with the most wondrous arguments and will never run into difficulties."

But when the king Ajātaśatru had heard these words they again did not strike him as good, and he went on to address the Grand Minister Sunidha:[131] "As this night is surpassingly clear and bright, what should we undertake to do?"

---

[129]Wu-wei t'ai-tzu 無畏太子. There may well be a mistake here, for it is doubtful whether Abhaya would have been referred to as Crown Prince. There seems little doubt that Udāyi had this title (as just mentioned in this text and supported in many other texts). We should probably read Wu-wei wang-tzu 無畏王子, "Prince Abhaya," which is the form found in the next line and which agrees with his common appelation in Pali: Abhayarājakumāra.

[130]明諸算數兼知天文地理.

[131]Hsü-ni-mo 須尼摩. It seems certain that this is the person referred to in the Pali tradition as Sunidha and identified in a similar context in Cl; nevertheless, it is not easy to reconcile the last syllable here, which points to ma, mu, ba and similar sounds, with the -dha that is required and that is correctly represented in Cl by t'o 陀.

Sunidha said to the king: "This mid-night is indeed surpassingly clear and bright. Now, Ajita is residing nearby, not far off, and great is his understanding. I pray, Great King, that you go and ask about this matter."

When the king had heard these words they again did not strike him as good, and he went on to address the brāhmaṇa Varṣakāra:[132] "As this mid-night is surpassingly clear and bright, what should we undertake to do?"

The brāhmaṇa replied: "This the fifteenth day is indeed surpassingly clear and bright. Now, Gośālīputra is residing nearby, not far off. I pray, Great King, that you go and ask about this matter."

When the king had heard these words they again did not accord with his wishes, and he went on to address the brāhmaṇa Mo-t'e:[133] "As this mid-night is surpassingly clear and bright, what should we do?"

The brāhmaṇa replied: "Your Majesty should be informed that Kakuda Kātyāyana is residing nearby, not far off. I pray, Great King, that you go and ask about this matter."

When the king had heard these words they again did not accord with his wishes, and he went on to address So-mo, Commander of the

---

[132] P'o-sha 婆沙. Perhaps simply Varṣa.

[133] 摩特梵志. 梵志 may translate different terms depending upon the literature in question. In the Chinese Dīrgha it seems to be consistently used for parivrājaka, but in the Ekottara it is usually the equivalent of 婆羅門, brāhmaṇa.

Army:[134] "As this mid-night is surpassingly clear and bright, what should we undertake to do?"

So-mo replied: "Sañjayin Vairaṭīputra is residing nearby, not far off: he understands all manner of calculation. You could go and ask about this matter."

When the king had heard these words they again did not accord with his wishes, and he went on to address the Grand Minister Tsui-sheng:[135] "As this the fifteenth day is surpassingly clear and bright, what should we undertake to do?"

Tsui-sheng said to the king: "There is Nirgrantha Jñātiputra, widely conversant with all sacred texts, supreme among teachers. I pray, Great King, that you go and ask about this matter."

When the king had heard these words they again did not accord with his wishes, and he reflected as follows: "But these men [here recommended] are dense and deluded: they cannot distinguish the true from the false and are without skillful expedients."[136]

At that time, Jīvaka Kumāra was at the left side of the king. The king turned and said to Jīvaka: "As this mid-night is surpassingly clear and bright, what should we undertake to do?"

---

[134] 索摩典兵師.

[135] 最勝大臣, lit. the Grand Minister "Most Victorious."

[136] 此諸人等斯是愚惑不別眞僞無有巧便. I have taken this to refer to the six heretics rather than to the king's company since it is clearly used of the former in a later passage.

Jīvaka at once came forward and prostrated himself before the king, saying: "The Thus Come is even now residing nearby, not far off, visiting my poor assembly grounds at the head of twelve hundred and fifty disciples. I pray, Great King, that you go and ask about this matter. For the Thus Come is intelligent, is radiant, and has no hesitations or obstructions. Knowing the affairs of the three worlds, there is nothing with which he is not familiar. When he expounds this matter to Your Majesty, Your Majesty will suddenly be enlightened with regard to your doubts and suspicions."

Now when the king Ajātaśatru had heard Jīvaka's words he was joyful and delighted, and a good disposition arose in him, whereupon he commended Jīvaka: "Excellent! Excellent! These words have been happily spoken by Kumāra. For I am utterly burning in body and mind, and I have without cause taken my father the king and killed him. For a long time I have pondered:[137] 'Who is capable of enlightening my mind?' What Jīvaka has here said strikes me as perfect. How marvellous and how remarkable that upon hearing the voice of the Thus Come one suddenly becomes greatly enlightened."

Then the king addressed the following gāthā to Jīvaka:

> Today is surpassingly clear and bright,
> But my mind has not been enlightened.
>
> All of you, please tell me:
> To whom should I go, to ask about this matter?

---

[137]我恒長夜作是念. Possibly: "Ceaselessly throughout the night I ponder."

Pūraṇa and Ajita,
And Nirgrantha, the Brahma-followers,[138]

Such as these cannot be relied upon
And are incapable of delivering anyone.

Today is surpassingly clear and bright;
The full moon is without blemish.

And now I would ask Jīvaka:
To whom should I go, to ask about this matter?

Then Jīvaka answered the king with a *gāthā*:

When you hear his most gentle voice
You will be able to escape the *makara*.[139]

I pray that you go now to the Buddha,
Who forever dwells in the fearless realm.

Then the king once more replied with a *gāthā*:

What I did in the past
Was of no benefit to the Buddha.

I killed that true Buddha's son
By the name of Bimbisāra.

Now I feel utmost remorse and shame
and cannot face the World Honoured One.

What can you be saying,
To have me go and see him?

---

[138] 梵弟子. Literally, this means "disciple of Brahma," an odd title for the six heretics. Most likely it is used *metri causa* for 梵志, which is used elsewhere in C3 to refer to the six heretics, and which (oddly) seems to stand for *brāhmaṇa* in the *Ekottara*.

[139] 摩竭魚. A mythological sea-creature of gigantic proportions. Presumably, it is used here to represent guilt and fear, or the destructive effects of evil action.

Then Jīvaka once more replied to the king with a gāthā:

All Buddhas are without [discrimination between]
"this" and "that";
All attachments have forever been cast aside.

To have a mind that is impartial and undivided--
This is the meaning of the Buddha's Law.

If one were to take fragrant sandal-wood paste
And anoint [the Buddha's] right hand

And, grasping a sword, were to cut off his left hand,
His mind would know no fluctuation.[140]

When grieving for his son Rāhula,
He sighed once, but not twice.[141]

He restrained himself where Devadatta was concerned,
Regarding enemies and friends as one.

I pray Your Majesty humble yourself
To go and look upon the face of the Thus Come.

He will certainly put an end to your doubts;
Let there, then, be no delay.

Then the king Ajātaśatru addressed Jīvaka Kumāra: "Then quickly make ready five hundred male and five hundred female elephants, and light five hundred lamps."

Jīvaka replied: "Even so, Great King."

Then Jīvaka Kumāra at once made ready the thousand elephants and lit five hundred lamps. He came forward and addressed the king:

---

[140] Cf. the passage in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya at T.1448: vol. 24, p. 20a, 10-14.

[141] 如愍羅云子．一息更無二. I have not found this incident referred to elsewhere.

"All have been made ready. Now is the time, Your Majesty."

Then the king Ajātaśatru at the head of all his company proceeded to the pear orchard, but midway he was suddenly taken with fear and his hair stood on end. He turned and addressed Jīvaka Kumāra: "I am not being deceived by you, am I? You are not going to seize me and deliver me to my enemies?"

Jīvaka said to the king: "Truly, I have no such intention. I pray, Great King, that you continue but a short way. The Thus Come is not far from here."

But the king Ajātaśatru still harbored fear in his mind, and he again addressed Jīvaka: "I am not being misled by you? For I have heard that the Thus Come is at the head of twelve hundred and fifty disciples, yet I hear no sound from them."

Jīvaka replied: "The Thus Come's disciples are ever in samādhi, and are free from disordered thoughts. I pray, Great King, that you continue but a short way."

The king Ajātaśatru then descended from his chariot and entered the gate on foot. When he was in front of the Discussion Hall, he stood there in silence. He surveyed the entire noble assembly and turned to address Jīvaka: "Where, then, is the Thus Come?"

At that moment the entire noble assembly entered into the Brilliant Samādhi,[142] illumining the discussion hall so that there was nowhere left in darkness. At this, Jīvaka at once prostrated himself and stretched out his right hand so as to point to the Thus

---

[142] 炎光三昧.

Come, saying: "This is the Thus Come, in the exact center, like the sun scattering the clouds."

The king Ajātaśatru then said to Jīvaka: "How marvellous and how remarkable, that the mental calm of this noble assembly is such as this! But what is the cause of this light?"

Jīvaka said to the king: "It is simply due to the power of samādhi that this light has come forth."

The king said further: "Even as I today survey this noble assembly that is surpassingly serene, so would I have the Crown Prince my son Udāyi similarly serene and quiescent."

Then the king Ajātaśatru folded his hands and announced: "I pray that the World Honoured One grace me with recognition."

The World Honoured One said: "Welcome, Great King."

When the king heard the voice of the Thus Come he was full of joy. The Thus Come then recognized the announcement of the king's title. Then the king Ajātaśatru, advancing to where the Buddha was, prostrated himself completely upon the ground. With both hands he covered the Thus Come's feet, and announced: "I pray, World Honoured One, that you condescend to have pity and accept the repentance of my error. My father the king was guiltless, yet I killed him. I pray that you accept my repentance, for I shall never again transgress, but would correct what is past and cultivate future [goodness]".

The World Honoured One said: "Now is precisely the time. It is fitting that you now repent your error, and you should not neglect the opportunity. When a man living in the world has committed an error and is able to set himself right, he is called the highest of

men, and in my Law there is nothing considered greater. It is fitting that you now repent."

Then when the king had honoured the feet of the Thus Come, he sat down to one side. The king addressed the Buddha: I would like to ask a question. If the Thus Come will permit me I shall venture to ask it."

The Buddha addressed the king: "If anyone has a problem, it is fitting that he ask about it now."

The king said to the Buddha: "If one in this present existence creates merit, will he receive present and visible recompense or not?"[143]

The Buddha said to the king: "Have you at any time in the past asked anyone else about this matter?"

The king said to the Buddha: "In the past I have indeed asked others about this matter, asking [for example] Pūraṇa Kāśyapa: 'What then, Pūraṇa Kāśyapa, if one in this present existence makes merit, will he receive present and visible recompense?' Pūraṇa Kāśyapa answered me as follows: 'There is no merit, and there is no giving. There is neither a present world nor a future world, nor is there recompense for good or evil. There are in the world no arhats, or such as are perfected in impartiality.' When on that occasion I asked about this recompense that involves receiving the fruit [of deeds], he replied saying: 'There does not exist.'[144] As if there were a man who inquired

---

[143]於現世造福得受現報不乎.

[144]彼報曰無也.

about the meaning of 'melon' and was answered in terms of a plum--so it was with this Kāśyapa. Then I thought: 'This brāhmaṇa has not explained what was asked of him by a man of the martial class, the royal caste. This man has answered me by cleverly drawing in superfluous matters.' World Honoured One, I had a mind to cut off his head. Not accepting his words, I at once had him sent away.

"Then I went on to Ajita and asked about this matter. Ajita replied to me thus: 'If to the east of a river one were to slay living beings and commit sins without limit, there would in fact be no sin, nor would there be any recompense involving evil fruit.'

"Then, World Honoured One, I again thought thus: 'I have just asked about this matter of receiving recompense in the present existence. This man has answered me by talking about 'slaying'. It was as if there were a man who, asking the meaning of 'pear', was answered in terms of a plum.' I left him at once and went away.

"I went on to Gośāla and asked about this matter. This man replied to me thus: 'If on the west bank of a river one were to do meritorious deeds such as could not be calculated, there would be in this no good recompense.'

"Then I again thought: 'As to that about which I inquired, his response has, in the end, missed the point.' And I again left him and went away.

"I went on to Kakuda Kātyāyana and asked about this matter. This man replied thus: 'Alone one comes into the world; alone one dies. Alone one goes and returns, experiencing pain and pleasure.'

"Then I again thought: 'What I have asked is if there is recompense in this present existence, but he has answered by taking

up the matter of birth and death.' And I again left him and went away.

"I went and asked Sañjayin Vairaṭīputra about the matter. This man answered me as follows: 'The past is already annihilated: it will never come into being again. The future has not yet arrived, and likewise has no existence. The present does not stay; not staying it is ever changing.'[145] Then again I thought: 'What I have asked is if there is recompense in this present existence, but I have been answered in terms of the "three realms." This does not make good sense.' So I left him and went away.

"Coming to Nirgrantha Jñātiputra, I inquired about this matter: 'What then, Nirgrantha Jñātiputra, if one in this present existence makes merit, will he receive recompense in this present existence?' He answered me as follows: 'Without cause, without condition, living beings become bound. There does not exist cause, nor does there exist condition, whereby living beings are stuck fast in these bonds. Without cause, without condition, living beings become pure.'

"Then I again thought thus: 'Of all these brāhmaṇas, this is the stupidest. He cannot distinguish the true from the false: he is sightless like the blind. What I have asked has, in the end, received no reply--as if he were mocking a man of the noble, wheel-turning royal caste'. And again I immediately left him and went away.

---

[145]Reading with the Three Editions: 現在不住 不住者即變易.

"Now, therefore, World Honoured One, I inquire about this matter: if one in this present existence makes merit, does he here and now receive recompense? I pray that the World Honoured One fully expound the matter."

Then the World Honoured One answered: "Great King, I will now put a question to you: answer as it pleases you. Great King, you have, I suppose, wine stewards and cooks, as well as servants and assistants charged with looking after various things?"

The king replied to the Buddha: "Certainly I have such."

"If these servants directed your work for a long time, would you reward them, or not?"

The king said to the Buddha: "I would promote them according to their achievements, and would give them no cause for ill feeling."

The Buddha said to the king: "By this expedient you may know that one who in the present existence makes merit, receives present and visible recompense. And what do you think, Great King: if they, having come to dwell in high estate, succoured the people according to propriety,[146] would you again reward them, or not?"

The king answered the Buddha: "Certainly, World Honoured One. I would have them eat the same delicacies as I, and again would not let them bear ill will."

The Buddha said to the king: "By this expedient you may know that while the place from which they originally came was most humble, by gradually amassing merit they have come to enjoy the same happiness

---

[146] 恤民以禮.

as Your Majesty. Hence, one who in this present existence makes merit receives present and visible recompense."

The Buddha said to the king: "Those men of good works might after the passage of years come to you and say: 'Our good works have been accomplished, as Your Majesty well knows.[147] We would have from Your Majesty that which our hearts desire.' Would Your Majesty grant it to them, or not?"

The king said to the Buddha: "Even as they desired, so would I grant it, and would not refuse them."

The Buddha said to the king: "If these men of good works wished to be able to take leave of Your Majesty and, shaving off beard and hair and donning the three Law-clothes, to go forth from home, study the Way and cultivate the pure course of conduct, would Your Majesty permit it, or not?"

The king said to the Buddha: "Certainly, I would permit it."

The Buddha said to the king: "And if Your Majesty saw those men (who had shaved off beard and hair, gone forth from home, and were studying the Way) in my presence, what would Your Majesty want to do?"

The king said to the Buddha: "Wait upon them, offer them food, and pay respect to them at the appropriate time."

The Buddha said to the king: "By this expedient you may know that one who in this present existence makes merit, receives present

---

[147] Reading 明知 rather than 朋知.

and visible recompense. Now suppose that these men of good works upheld the discipline in its entirety, so that they committed not the slightest infraction--what would Your Majesty want to do?"

The king said to the Buddha: "For as long as they lived I would provide them with clothing, food and drink, couches and mats for sleeping, and medicines for illness. I would not permit them to go in want."

The Buddha said to the king: "By this expedient you may know that one who in this present life makes merit, receives present and visible recompense. Now suppose further that those men, having become śramanas, were to put an end to the Outflows and become free from Outflows, with mind set free and wisdom set free, and having personally verified [the truth] were to go forth and teach it to others--birth and death at an end, the Brahma-conduct secure, having done what was to be done, never again to take on existence. If Your Majesty knew this to be the case, what would you want to do?"

The king said to the Buddha: "For as long as they lived I would wait upon them, provide them with clothing, food and drink, couches and mats for sleeping, and medicines for illness. I would not allow them to go in need."

The Buddha said to the king: "By this expedient you may know that one who in this present existence makes merit, receives present and visible recompense. And suppose further that such a man at life's end entered through parinirvāṇa into the realm of nirvāṇa without residue. What would Your Majesty want to do?"

The king said to the Buddha: "I would at the place where four roads meet erect a great temple[148] and, further, would there offer incense and flowers, hang up banners and umbrellas, and offer my obeisance and respect. For this would be the body of a god, not the body of a man."[149]

The Buddha said to the king: "By this expedient you may know that one who in this present existence makes merit receives present and visible recompense.

The king said to the Buddha: "I have in this illustration received an explanation. Today the World Honoured One has repeatedly elucidated the matter, and from this day forth I will faithfully keep this explanation. I pray the World Honoured One accept me as a disciple: I take refuge in the Buddha, the Law, and the bhiksu Saṅgha. Now I again repent that in my stupidity and delusion I killed my father the king, though he was blameless. Now, for the rest of my life I take refuge. I pray that the World Honoured One dispel my guilt and increase my good dharmas, [that I may attain to] lasting peace.[150] For I know that what I have done has incurred only evil recompense, and has produced no good roots."

The Buddha said to the king: "In the world there are two types of persons that are free from sin, and that are reborn in the heavens

---

[148] 大神寺. Probably stūpa or caitya.

[149] 彼是天身非為人身.

[150] 唯願世尊除其罪懲演其妙法長夜無為. 演其妙法 could simply mean "expound the True Dharma", but we must keep in mind such parallel passages as that in S: "vṛddhir evāsya pratikāṃkṣitavyā kusalānāṃ dharmanāṃ na hānih ("he may expect an augmentation of good dharmas rather than a diminution").

instantly, as quickly as the bending of one's arm. And what are the two? The first is he who produces no sinful roots, but cultivates good [roots]. The second is he who commits sin but corrects what he has done. These are the two types of person who at life's end are born in the heavens, and that without obstruction or delay."

Then the World Honoured One spoke this gāthā:

Though a man do the most evil of actions,
Repenting his error, the guilt become negligible.

If he daily repent without laxness or respite
The sinful roots will be forever plucked out.

Therefore, Great King, one must govern by Dharma, not by what is contrary to Dharma. For, one who governs by Dharma, when his body dissolves and his life is ended, is born in a good ealm, in the heavens. And when his life is ended his fame and praise will spread far, and will be heard throughout the world. Those who come after will pass it on that in former times there was a king who governed by the True Dharma, having nothing to do with the crooked and the wrong. So people will praise and remember the place where that man was born. [And, while alive, such a king's] years will be increased, and he will not die young.

"Therefore, Great King, let your heart be joyful, and turn to the Three Honoured Ones: the Buddha, the Law and the Noble Assembly. In this manner, Great King, you ought to undertake your training."

Then the king Ajātaśatru forthwith arose from his seat, honoured the Buddha's feet with his head and face, and took his leave. When the king was still not far off, the Buddha addressed the bhikṣus: "The king Ajātaśatru, if he had not killed his father the king, would today have attained to the experience of the first fruit of the śramaṇa's life,

within the Four Pairs and the Eight Groups.[156] Further, he would have attained to the Noble Eightfold Way,[157] dispelled the Eight Cravings,[158] and surmounted the Eight Difficulties.[159] Nevertheless, he has even so seized a great good fortune, and acquired the faith without roots.[160] Hence, bhikṣus, when it is a case of a man who has committed sin one must search for an expedient in order to bring about this faith without roots. Among my upāsakas, the one who has acquired this faith that needs no roots is this very Ajātaśatru."

When the bhikṣus had heard the Buddha's discourse, they rejoiced and did his bidding.

---

[156]今日應得初沙門果證在四雙八輩之中. It is not certain that this constitutes a reference to the title and theme of the sutra as represented in other versions, that is, "the fruit of the life of a śramaṇa." We have here, rather, a reference to the scheme of the "four fruits of the śramaṇa," of which the first and lowest one, that here referred to, is in Pali called sotāpattiphala, the fruit of having entered the stream. The next two technical expressions mentioned in the text belong to the same scheme. He who attains the fruit of sotāpatti is called sotāpanna ("stream-enterer"): these two, the attained and the attainer, together constitute a pair (雙). Altogether there are four such pairs (四雙) and eight individual items (八輩).

[157]The familiar aṣṭāṅgika mārga.

[158]八愛. I do not know what these are.

[159]八難. The eight unfavorable births (in the hells, as a preta, etc.).

[160]無根信 = amūlakā śraddhā (see S).

C4 (untitled)

At that time the World Honoured One was residing in the city of Rājagṛha, in the āmra grove of Jīvaka the prince.[162]

King Ajātaśatru, on the night of the fifteenth day of the fifth month at the time of the beginning of the summer retreat, when the bright moon was shining forth with great splendor in the clear sky, being together with his ministers, wives and concubines up in his lofty mansion, addressed them all: "Now that the moon tonight is serenely clear, roundly bright and lovely, what shall you and I do? Let each set forth his feelings and expound on this matter."

There was a concubine who at once replied: "Great King, while a man lives let him enjoy himself, and not idly waste his time. On this excellent evening we ought to amuse ourselves, give free rein to our feelings, and experience the satisfaction of the five desires. This is fitting activity for Your Majesty."

And further there was a woman who said: "Great King, my wish is that all the religious folk[163] of Rājagṛha gather together in celebration, and together experience the satisfaction of their desires. This is fitting activity for Your Majesty."

Then the Crown Prince Udāyi spoke: "Great King, if now on this bright night Your Majesty were personally to lead the four-fold

---

[162] Wang-tzu Shih-fu-chia 王子侍縛迦. "Kumāra" is interpreted here as "king's son", "prince"; elsewhere it is usually translated as "youth" (童子).

[163] 道俗. Probably refers to religious lay men and women in general, with no restrictions as to sectarian affiliation.

army to punish those states that do not acknowledge your sovereignty, and then when the borderlands are quiet were to return in victory, this would be fitting activity for Your Majesty."

And further there was a chief minister, a follower of a heretical sect, who spoke saying: "Great King, this brightly moonlit night is striking to the eye, is serenely clear. On this the fifteenth day at the beginning of the summer retreat, you might [go] to Pūraṇa and the others of the six teachers of great comprehension, who are honoured by men, praised as the chief of men, each of them with five hundred naked disciples constantly following and in attendance. At present they are in the city of Rājagṛha, intending to pass the summer retreat here. They are able to dispel all doubts.[164] It would be well for us to hasten to their feet, pay them honour and make offering to them. This would be fitting activity for Your Majesty."

And further there was Jīvaka the prince sitting amidst the company. The king addressed him: "And why, Jīvaka, are you silent, the only one who has said nothing?"

Jīvaka replied: "Great King, now that we are favored with this auspicious day, the brilliant moon of utmost clarity such that it is lovely to all men at this time of the beginning of the summer retreat: the Buddha, the World Honoured One, possessor of all mighty virtues, having with him most noble disciples, his compassion over-

---

[164] The text reads: 堪消物利. Being unable to make good sense of this, I have, after a comparison with the other versions, adopted a reading of 堪消狐疑.

spreading all, the guide and teacher of the world, the supreme field of merit, is residing in my grove for the summer retreat. It would be well for you to go in person and make offering to him. This would be fitting activity for Your Majesty."

When the king Ajātaśatru had heard these words he had preparation made with majesty, and mounted his great bull elephant.[165] In addition he had five hundred court women mount five hundred elephants, each of the women holding a bright torch, and together with all his followers he proceeded to the āmra grove. Midway the king was taken with fear, his hair stood on end, and he had the following thought: "Could it be that this Jīvaka has made a pact with the enemies on my borders to lead me on and destroy my life?" So he asked Jīvaka: "With how many men is the Buddha, the World Honoured One, residing in the grove?"

"With twelve hundred and fifty bhikṣus."

The king asked him: "If you are not intent on treachery how is it that I do not hear even the sound of a cough, since there are so many men?"

Jīvaka answered him: "The Buddha, the World Honoured One, is completely serene in the three modes of activity,[166] and his mind

---

[165]大香象. Lit. "Great fragrant elephant," probably for Skt. (mahā) gandhahastin or gandhagaja. The expression comes from the fact that the male elephant in "must" exudes an odoriferous juice (mada, mada-vāri, etc.) from his temples. The term "fragrant elephant," however, seems flexible in its application and here simply means a bull elephant in the pride of his strength.

[166]Thought, word and deed.

is ever in meditation. His disciples are likewise. It is for this reason that there is no din or noise."

When the king heard these words his mind was set completely at rest and he had no further doubts. He quickly arrived at the place where the Buddha was, and when [the company] had dismounted from the elephants and horses [the king] saw the Buddha, the World Honoured One, together with the entire great assembly--all their sense faculties utterly calm, as serene as the ocean.[167] He at once prostrated himself with his five limbs[168] touching the earth, honoured the Buddha's feet with his head, joined his palms together and spoke to the Buddha: "The World Honoured One is greatly compassionate and utterly serene in the three modes of activity: I pray that you rightly guide and instruct my son so that he may be forever free of disorder and strife even as is the Buddha."

Then the Thus Come from his compassionate heart consolingly admonished the king: "Excellent, Great King. May you at once be seated. Let all those who have doubts and difficulties ask freely regarding them."

When he was seated [the king] addressed the Buddha: "World Honoured One, in the world there are various types of occupational activity. There are those who tie together flower garlands, there

---

[167]This unhappy simile results from the translation of hrada as "ocean" (海), where "lake" or "pool" would have been better. The Tibetan has mthso, "lake."

[168]五體. Explained variously, but most simply as arms, legs and head (otherwise, as head, knees and elbows).

are workers in bamboo; again, there are butchers, merchants and trainers of elephants and horses; there are speech-makers, and archers, and those who beg for a living; there are those who serve the king in battle with their valor and strength, as well as barbers, washers and dyers, and tailors. All these sorts of people by means of their particular toil seek wealth and sustenance. According as they wish they build up merit and indulge in the delight of the five desires. World Honoured One, are there any of these types of living beings who in the present world obtain the fruit of the *śramaṇa*'s life, or not?"[169]

The Buddha then put a question to the king: "Great King, have you ever asked after this fashion of other men?"

The king addressed the Buddha: "World Honoured One, when I asked the heretics such as Pūraṇa and the rest about this matter, those various teachers replied: 'In our scriptures the following doctrine is expounded: "There is no good or bad action; there is no good or bad recompense. There is no giving and no sacrifice; there is no action of giving or sacrifice. There is neither father nor mother; there is no father love or mother love. There exists neither this world nor another world. There is no one who, having striven on the Path, has attained the noble fruit; there are no noble persons nor those who have attained the fruit of Arhatship. When the four

---

[169] 世尊頗有如是衆生之類於現世中得沙門果不。 Vogel (*Six Heretics*, p. 45) has: "World Honoured One! There are a good many such groups of living beings. They do get in the visible world the fruit of śramaṇahood, do they not?"

elements have dispersed there is nothing left upon which to depend or rest. If there are those who say that the present world and the next world, cause of action and fruit of action, really and truly exist, they are all liars. Both the speech of the wise and the gossip of fools are empty and vain."'"

Then the king Ajātaśatru again addressed the Buddha, saying: "World Honoured One, I asked[170] the six teachers about various substantial matters but they all replied with foolishness.[171] It was as if someone asked about an <u>āmra</u> fruit and one answered him in terms of a pear; or as if, when he asked about a pear, one answered him in terms of an <u>āmra</u>. The six teachers of perverted views, Pūraṇa and the rest, being questioned straightforwardly answered obliquely. And while these heretics in this manner made various types of oblique speech and various types of oblique reply, none of it accorded with my feelings and I did not rejoice in it, but abandoned them and went away. I went on to ask of the rest of the six unorthodox teachers such as Maskarin Gośālīputra: 'In this very world each living being

---

[170]Adopting the Ming reading of 問 in place of 聞.

[171]世尊我聞 (or 問) 六師種種實義. Vogel (<u>Six Heretics</u>, p. 46) has: "World Honoured One! I have heard the six teachers' manifold ideas of reality; they all answered in a false way." In a footnote he then mentions the Ming reading and offers a correspondingly altered translation. But either way this seems to fit poorly in the context of the utterance and to be especially doubtful in view of later remarks such as 正問邪答 ("being questioned straightforwardly they answered obliquely"). The point is that the king has asked a concrete and meaningful question whereas the replies he receives are evasive and confused. He has not asked about "reality."

does some particular type of work, does some type of activity, does some sort of craft; he waits upon father and mother, makes offering to the three treasures, and contributes to the field of compassion.[172] Among these sorts of living beings depending upon these sorts of work, are there those who attain the Path and reach to the noble fruit, or not?'

"And he answered: 'In our scriptures the following is expounded: "There is no cause [of action], no fruit [of action], no good and no evil; there are no afflictions and there is no one who extirpates them; there is no nirvāṇa and there is no one who attains it. All 'causes' and 'fruits' in the three realms[173] are empty and inexistent. Everything is as it is spontaneously: the wise man is spontaneously wise and the foolish man spontaneously foolish. There is no one who cultivates and there is no one who attains, and there is no profiting oneself and there is no profiting others. All living beings without cause are born and without cause are extinguished."'

"All these teachers produced this sort of foolish talk. It was neither good talk nor rational talk. I made a question about

---

[172] 供給悲田. That is, he gives to the needy and at the same time lays up treasure in heaven for himself, since his good deeds mature as appropriate karmic recompense.

[173] 三世. Vogel (Six Heretics, p. 46, n. 51) identifies this as: "Skr. traidhātuka, i.e. the world of desire (kāmadhātu), the world of form (rūpadhātu) and the world of formlessness (arūpyadhātu)." It is more likely that it refers to Skt. tryadhvan, i.e. the "three times" or "three realms" of past, present and future. See, for example, the use of the expression 三世 in C3 (after Sañjayin's theory): T.125: vol. 2, p. 663b, 27.

the east and was answered from the west. Though I heard all these various sorts of oblique talk they did not accord with my feelings, nor did I rejoice in them, nor did I accept them. I rejected [these teachers] and took my leave.

"I went on to Sañjayin and again put forth all these various sorts of problems as before: 'Living beings, doing all sorts of work and all sorts of craft, do work pertaining to [the realm of] birth and death. With respect to this work, are there any living beings who on the basis of this very sort of work are able to put an end to the afflictions and experience the noble fruit, or not?'

"He answered: 'May it please Your Majesty, in what I expound I always teach living beings [as follows]:[174] "Oneself to practice killing or to cause another to kill, oneself to cut or to cause others to cut, oneself to roast or to cause others to roast, oneself to practice robbery or to cause others to rob, oneself to practice debauchery or to cause others to debauch themselves, oneself to speak lies or to cause others to lie, oneself to drink liquor or to cause others to drink liquor, oneself to plunder or to cause others to plunder, to destroy a house or to destroy a state, to kill every living being one meets whether moving on the earth or in the sky; indeed, to

---

[174] 大王當知我所說者常教衆生自行殺生教他殺害 etc. Vogel (Six Heretics, p. 47) has: "The great king shall know that in what I teach I constantly instruct living beings themselves to engage in killing life and to induce others to kill," etc. It is quite possible that he is right. The structure of this passage is awkward and difficult.

kill living beings without number or limit, to manage on the near shore of the Ganges to kill living beings without limit and commit limitless evil while on the far shore of the Ganges making offering to living beings without number or limit and doing good deeds without number or limit--both these sorts of activity would be without cause and without fruit, would involve neither gain nor loss, would lead neither to increase nor decrease.''

"World Honoured One, I asked about a substantial matter and he made these sorts of foolish speech. I put a question about the east and he answered about the west. When I had heard this I was not delighted with it nor did I rejoice in it, but at once abandoned him and left.

I then went elsewhere, to Ajita Keśakambalin. I asked him straightforwardly as before and he answered obliquely as before. He spoke as follows: 'In all, there are seven things. These seven sorts of things are in their essence self-existent:[175] they are not created by something else, they do not arise through transformation. They have not come together, nor do they disperse. They remain ever self-existent. And what are the seven? Earth, water, fire, wind, suffering, pleasure and life. These are the seven things. There is no one who is able to create them, and they do not injure one another.

---

[175] Or, as Vogel says (Six Heretics, p. 48): "These seven sorts of substances are materially so of themselves."

With regard to good and evil as well as pain and pleasure, what is not painful and not pleasurable: as far as the seven things are concerned, whether one acts or does not act there is in no case remembrance, experience or informing.[176] There is no one who dies and there is no one who kills. As for the fourteen thousand types of pleasure, there are sixty thousand more beyond these. As to the evils such as the "three karma", "two karma", "one karma" and "half karma"--if one is able to commit all such evils as these he will get to escape the pains of birth and death...[177]

S (untitled)

"...and he knows: 'For me, rebirth is destroyed; the brahmacarya is fulfilled; what had to be done is done; after this there will be no further existence.'

"What do you think, Great King: this being so, have I not shown the fruit of the śramaṇa's life pertaining to this very existence?"

"Truly, Your Honour, this being so the fruit of the śramaṇa's life pertaining to this very existence has been shown by the Lord."

---

[176]於善於惡及苦樂不苦不樂. 此之七事作與不作俱無記驗亦無報. Vogel (Six Heretics, p. 48) has: "For good (acts) and for bad (acts), one gets (as retribution) misery and pleasure (or) no misery and no pleasure. These seven things are made and not made. There is no remembering and investigating at all, and no informing either." The passage is very obscure and both translations are guesses.

[177]The sutra ends abruptly here.

This having been said, the king Ajātasatru[178] began to weep, shedding tears like rain. Then the king Ajātasatru, wiping away his tears with the corner of his robe and falling at the Lord's feet, said to the Lord: "I have transgressed, Lord; I have transgressed, Sugata--in that, foolish, stupid, unintelligent and inept as I was, associating with a bad friend, fallen under the power of a bad friend, embraced by a bad friend, I put to death my father, that just man and just king. May you out of compassion accept my [confession of] transgression, inasmuch as I both recognize and see my transgression."

"Truly, Great King, you have committed a transgression, in that, foolish, stupid, unintelligent and inept that you were, associating with a bad friend, fallen under the power of a bad friend, embraced by a bad friend, you put to death your father, that just man and just king. Because, Great King, you recognize and see your transgression, and seeing it confess it and attain to control in the future, you may expect an augmentation of good dharmas rather than a diminution. And why? Whoever, Great King, recognizes and sees his transgression, and seeing it confesses it and attains to control in the future, may expect an augmentation of good dharmas rather than a diminution. Hence even so, Great King, because you recognize and see your transgression, and seeing it confess it and attain to control in the future, you may expect an augmentation of good dharmas rather than a diminution."

---

[178]I have taken the liberty of shortening the king's appellation throughout this version. He is in the Sanskrit text (as in the Pali) always referred to as "the king of Magadha, Ajātaśatru Vaidehīputra".

Then the king Ajātaśatru said to the Lord: "May the Lord consent to share a meal with me tomorrow in my palace, together with the company of monks!"

The Lord consented by silence to the request of the king Ajātaśatru.

And when the king Ajātaśatru had seen by the Lord's silence that he had consented, and when he had rejoiced and delighted in the words of the Lord and had honoured the Lord's feet with his head, he left the presence of the Lord.

Then the Lord, seeing that the king Ajātaśatru was still not far off, addressed the monks: "Injured and stricken, monks, is the king Ajātaśatru, who, associating with a bad friend, fallen under the power of a bad friend, embraced by a bad friend, put to death his father--that just man and just king, that great king who stood in justice. If, monks, the king Ajātaśatru had not killed his father--that just man and just king, that great king who stood in justice--it is possible that even as he sat here he would have penetrated the Four Noble Truths. Even so, monks, has the king Ajātaśatru been injured and stricken. Therefore, monks, you ought to train yourselves as follows: 'We shall not let our minds be defiled even on the stake; how much less while in this living body!'[179] In this manner, monks, you should train yourselves."

---

[179] Dagdhasthūṇāyāmapi cittam na pradūṣayiṣyāmaḥ prāg eva savijñānake kāye. The Tibetan translation takes dagdhasthūṇā as "the burnt stump of a tree" (sdoṅ-dum thsig-pa: see Dutt, Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part IV, p. 224, n. 3; the Peking edition appears to be corrupt here). I do not know what a dagdhasthūṇā is, and the translation is tentative.

The king Ajātaśatru, that night having prepared pure and excellent food both hard and soft, arose at daybreak, arranged seats and set in place water pots, and had the time announced to the Lord by messenger: "It is time, Your Honour, the meal is ready: whatever time the Lord thinks fitting."

Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, took his bowl and outer robe and proceeded to the food-offering of the king Ajātaśatru, surrounded by the retinue of monks, attended by the company of monks. When he arrived he sat down facing the company of monks on the seat that had been prepared for him. The king Ajātaśatru, seeing the company of monks seated comfortably facing the Buddha, with his own hands served and satisfied them with pure and excellent food both hard and soft. And when he had with his own hands served and satisfied them in manifold ways with pure and excellent food both hard and soft, and when he had seen that the Lord had finished eating and had washed his hands and put away his bowl, he took a low seat and sat before the Lord in order to hear Dharma.

Then the Lord expressed his gratitude for the offering of the king Ajātaśatru with a verse of thanks:

> Sacrifices have the Agnihotra as their chief;
> The chief of metres is the Sāvitrī.
>
> The moon is the chief of stars,
> The sun the chief of luminaries.
>
> Above, across, below:
> Wherever living creatures dwell,

In the worlds together with their gods,
The Fully Enlightened One is the best of
those honoured with offerings.[180]

Then the Lord instructed, inspired, inflamed and delighted the king Ajātaśatru with his discourse on Dharma. And when he had in manifold ways instructed, inspired, inflamed and delighted with his discourse on Dharma, he arose from his seat and took his leave.

---

[180] Sambuddho hījyatāṃ varaḥ. I have taken ijyatāṃ as a passive form with an active ending (= ijyamānānām) used metri causa. This is common enough in Buddhist Sanskrit (see Franklin Edgerton's Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), I, 37.14) and is the reading universally supported in the Chinese versions of the gāthā.

The Tibetan text has: "smra-bai mchog-ni rdzogs-saṅs-rgyas", meaning: "the chief of speech is the Fully Enlightened One".

II

THE ANCIENT TEXT

This chapter is historical in intent. The aim is to determine the relationships among the different members of the *Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra* family, and to discover the text that is ancestral to them all. After some preliminary considerations, the extant versions will be compared in some detail, during which comparison judgements as to the relative antiquity of the various sections of the text will be made. The results of the enquiry will then be set forth.

The Place of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra in the Canon

There is every reason to believe that the title of our text from very early times was "The Sutra on the Fruits of the Life of a *Śramaṇa*" (Skt. *Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra*). This form is attested in the literature of the Theravāda and the Mahāsāṅghika.[1] In addition, it is attested in the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka, and of course in our texts C1 and C2. The only alternate title for which there is any evidence is "Faith Without Roots" (*Wu-ken hsin* = *Amūlikā Śraddhā*).[2] The evidence for this form is very weak: it occurs as a name for the text only in

---

[1] In Pali, of course, the form is *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*. For the Mahāsāṅghika evidence, see below, pp. 117.

[2] See above, pp. 15, 17.

the Chinese Ekottara, which, as will later be seen, is not a reliable witness as regards the ancient state of the sutra.

Of the extant versions of the text, four are from the Sūtra Piṭaka and three from the Vinaya Piṭaka. More specifically, among the former, two are from the Dīrgha (P, C1), one occurs separately, its origin unknown (C2), and one belongs to the Ekottara (C3). The remaining three are all from the work in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya known as the Saṅghabhedavastu. Where did the text most anciently belong?

There is no doubt that it was present in the Sūtra Piṭaka earlier than in the Vinaya Piṭaka. As noted above, it was known from a very early date as a sutra(Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra); moreover, its presence in a number of Sūtra Piṭakas is directly attested.[3] Of the extant Vinayas it occurs only in that of the Mūlasarvāstivāda. How, therefore, does one explain its presence in this Vinaya? Two points can be made in answer to this, one concerning the composition of Vinayas generally, and the other concerning the specific use of our sutra in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivāda.

One of the ways that the Vinayas of the various schools grew was through the incorporation of narrative material. Many jātakas were absorbed, as was much sutra material. The Vinayas differ in the extent to which this material is used and also in the extent to which the incorporated material is repeated in full in the written text.

---

[3]See below, p. 107 for references attesting its inclusion in the Dīrgha Āgama of several schools.

The Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya as found in the Chinese makes great use of ellipsis and this is undoubtedly one reason for its shortness in printed text as compared with the other Vinayas. The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivāda, on the other hand, gives a vast amount of narrative and generally gives it in full. There is, therefore, nothing initially implausible about the incorporation of our sutra in extenso in this Vinaya. Beyond this, however, there are specific reasons for the insertion of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra in this collection.

All Vinayas have a section devoted to schism. In most of them this is incorporated into the legend of Devadatta, who is supposed to have created a schism in the Saṅgha during the Buddha's lifetime.[4] His attempt is ultimately frustrated through the combined efforts of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, who persuade the schismatic monks to abandon Devadatta and to return repentant to the Buddha's company. The Mūlasarvāstivādin school has taken the legend a step further than the other schools in its long separate work, the Saṅghabhedavastu. Here the story is greatly lengthened, chiefly by means of the careful exploration of symbols and problems inherent in the earlier versions, and by the inclusion of numerous jātaka tales, uttered by the Buddha on the slightest pretext. It is easy to see how the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra has found its way into this material. Devadatta the Saṅgha-breaker is,

---

[4]See Cullavagga 7 (Saṅghabhedaka Khandhaka) for the Theravādin account. For the Sarvāstivādin account see T.1435: vol. 23, pp. 257ff. and for the Mūlasarvāstivādin account see the Saṅghabhedavastu, preserved fully in Chinese in T.1450: vol. 24, pp. 99ff. For the shorter Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka accounts see T.1421: vol. 22, pp. 164ff. and T.1428: vol. 22, pp. 909ff. respectively.

in all of the developed versions of the legend, closely connected with king Ajātaśatru. It is Devadatta who persuades Ajātaśatru to kill his father Bimbisāra so that he may rule in his stead, and it is Ajātaśatru who assists Devadatta in the latter's attempts to kill the Buddha and take over leadership of the Saṅgha. The events described in the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra may obviously be fit into this story, for they show Ajātaśatru repenting the murder of his father, promising to act morally in the future, and going over to the Buddha's party. This change of heart can be seen as marking the downfall of Devadatta, who has thus lost his chief supporter. And, in fact, it is in precisely this way that the sutra is incorporated into the Devadatta legend in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.

Given that the sutra anciently belonged to the Sūtra Piṭaka, one may ask to which particular section (āgama, nikāya) it belonged. The Dīrgha is the most likely candidate. We have direct evidence that it was part of the Dīrgha of the Theravāda, the Mahīśāsaka,[5] and the sect of our Cl. Evidence for its inclusion in the Dīrghas of other schools is indirect. There is general agreement among the sects that the Dīrgha Āgama ("Long Āgama") is so named because it contains the longest sutras; more accurately, it was formed by collecting the longest sutras into one group.[6] Since the Śrāmanyaphala Sūtra is by all reasonable

---

[5]See the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, T.1421: vol. 22, p. 191a.

[6]See, for example, the Mahāsāṅghika account in T.1425: vol. 22, p. 491c. For the parallel passages in the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka Vinayas, see T.1421: vol. 22, p. 191a and T.1428: vol. 22, p. 968b respectively.

criteria a long sutra, it follows that it belongs in the Dīrgha.[7] The possibility exists, of course, that the versions of the text no longer extant, the most important of which for our purposes would be that of the Mahāsāṅghikas, were shorter than those available to us. There is good evidence, however, that the Mahāsāṅghika version was long, and this virtually clinches the argument for the Dīrgha as the sutra's most ancient home.[8]

And yet one version of the sutra (C3) is found in the Ekottara. How is its presence here to be explained? For inclusion in the Ekottara Āgama (= Pali Aṅguttara Nikāya) a sutra must contain a collection or enumeration of items such as allows it to be classified in one of the numerical groups (the group of the ones, the twos, etc.). Our sutra occurs in the Ekottara among the eights. But what has the Śrāmaṇya-phala Sūtra to do with "eight"? The answer is, nothing. Yet the redactors of the Ekottara in question, conscious of the need formally to justify its inclusion at thispoint, have the Buddha remark toward the conclusion of the text:

> The king Ajātaśatru, if he had not killed his father the king, would today have attained the experience of the first fruit of the śramaṇa's life, within the Four Pairs and the Eight Groups.

---

[7]This is complex issue, but in both the Pali and Chinese canons the sutras of the Dīrgha are generally at least twice as long as those in the Madhyama, and the ṣutras of the remaining āgamas are usually much shorter still. The Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra in all of its extant forms fits most naturally in the Dīrgha. (Note that in any case there is no evidence to suggest that it ever belonged to the Madhyama.)

[8]See passage B, below p. 117, from the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya. It is obvious from this that the sutra was considered to be a long one.

> Further, he would have attained the Noble Eightfold Way, dispelled the Eight Cravings, and surmounted the Eight Difficulties.[9]

None of these groups of eight items has any special connection with the text and none is attested in the other versions. That they have been added to justify the insertion of the sutra is patent. This being the case, we are still in the dark as to the real cause, as opposed to the post facto justification, of the sutra's presence here.

A study of the context of the sutra in the Ekottara solves the problem. The sutra directly preceding it is that containing the parable of the foolish and the wise cowherds. The former, we are told, pays attention neither to the state of the Ganges River nor the strength of his cattle, and the animals come to grief in crossing the flood-swollen river; the latter is skilled in these matters and gets his cattle across without loss. In explaining the parable the Buddha says:

> Hence, Monks, you must set your minds to avoid laxness in your practice, and you must seek for an expedient whereby to bring to completion the Noble Eightfold Way. Having had recourse to this Noble Way you will be able to carry yourselves across the ocean of birth and death. For it is like the case of the foolish cowherd, who is to be identified with the heretical teacher: he not only drowns in the stream of birth and death himself, but causes others too to sink in evil. The Ganges River is to be identified with the ocean of birth and death. The wise cowherd is the Thus Come. Crossing the troubles of birth and death is dependent upon the Eightfold Way. Hence, Monks, you must seek for an expedient whereby to bring to completion this Eightfold Way. In this manner, Monks, you should undertake your training.[10]

---

[9]See above, pp. 88-89.

[10]T.125: vol. 2, pp. 762-763.

This parable is found in other places in the ancient canon,[11] and the point is always that the Buddha is a skilled guide in whom reliance may be placed, whereas reliance in other teachers is misplaced and dangerous. In the Ekottara account the unskilled teachers are not explicitly identified with the famous six heretics, but the connection is made in other contexts and in any case would have been an obvious one.[12] We have here the reason for the introduction of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra into the collection at this point. The theme of the misguided and unskilled teachers versus the skilled and enlightened one (the Buddha) is well exemplified in our text. Evidently the parable of the cowherd brought this theme to the mind of the transmitter or redactor, and this led to the insertion of the Śrāmaṇyaphala here. It is no accident that of all the versions of the sutra, the one that most explicitly makes the distinction between the unskilled and the skilled is C3.[13]

Given that the text belonged anciently to the Dīrgha Āgama of the Sūtra Piṭaka, one wishes next to know its original position within the Dīrgha. Was it, for example, originally the second sutra in the collection, as is the case in the Pali Canon? We have information

---

[11]See, for example, MN I, 225ff. (Cūḷagopālaka Sutta). See also T.99: vol. 2, p. 342 for a version from the Chinese Saṃyukta Āgama (Tsa a-han 雜阿含).

[12]The identification is made in the Saṃyukta version. T.99: vol. 2, p. 342.

[13]It should also be mentioned that there is much material from the Devadatta legend incorporated in the Chinese Ekottara. This may have been a further stimulus for the inclusion of the Śrāmaṇyaphala in this collection. C3 is the only version that includes explicit mention of Devadatta.

on the internal structure of at least four Dīrghas. While they contain similar material, there is very little agreement on the ordering of this material. In the Pali Dīgha Nikāya, the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra occupies second place; in the Chinese Dīrgha it occupies twenty-seventh place (out of a total of thirty sutras). In the Mahīśāsaka Dīrgha it was apparently fifth, and in that of the Dharmaguptakas its position was different again.[14] There would seem to have been considerable fluidity, and perhaps arbitrariness, in the internal arrangement of this collection. Since there is nothing obviously more ancient or correct about any of the proffered arrangements,[15] no decision can be made here as to the original place of our stura in the Dīrgha.

The Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra, therefore, present in the Buddhist Canon from a very ancient date,[16] occupied an indeterminate position within the Dīrgha Āgama of the Sūtra Piṭaka.

---

[14]The Sāmaññaphala must have occupied second place in the Dīgha from an early date. This is assumed in the Pali Vinaya to be its correct position. See Cullavagga 11 (Pañcasatika Khandhaka), 287. See also Sumaṅgala, 14. For its position in the Mahīśāsaka Dīrgha, see T.1421: vol. 22, p. 191a. It is not mentioned in the brief description of the Dharmaguptaka Dīrgha (T.1428:vol. 22, p. 968b) but it is virtually certain from the evident similarity of the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka Dīrghas that it was part of this collection.

[15]The problem of the oldest form of the Dīrgha cannot be said to have been solved yet, but some excellent work has been done on it, especially by Japanese scholars. See Mayeda, Genshi Bukkyo Seiten no seiritsushi kenkyū, pp. 620ff.

[16]That is, from a date before the first schism, because its presence in the canon is witnessed by both the Mahāsāṅghikas and the Sthaviravādins.

Sectarian Affiliation and Textual Reconstruction

The historical levels that may be reached in textual studies depend upon the sources available and the methods employed. In Buddhist studies, the comparison of texts from different sectarian traditions cannot itself carry us beyond 350 B.C. (although it may yield insights that allow us to reach back further in time). This appears to have been the time of the first major schism in the Buddhist community, which resulted in a partition into the Sthaviravādin and Mahāsāṅghika schools.[17] If one has versions of a text from the canons of these two sects, therefore, he should, through careful comparison, be able to make progress in the reconstruction of the text as it existed at this high level of antiquity.[18] Fortunately, Vinaya texts from both schools have survived to the present day. With sutra materials, however, we are not so favored: with the doubtful exception of the Ekottara discussed above, all of the extant literature belongs to the Sthaviravādin stream. This means that our reconstructive efforts with sutra texts can take us back only to the period of later schisms within the Sthaviravāda.

As explained earlier, the sectarian affiliations of our texts are not as clear as might be desired. This does not, however, render

---

[17] I follow Bareau here. Conciles, Chapter 3.

[18] This assumes a lack of borrowing among sects. All one can do at this stage of Buddhist studies is say that research done to date appears to support the assumption of closed as opposed to open traditions. Note, however, the reservations expressed at the conclusion of the present technical study, below p. 195.

textual comparison and reconstruction impossible, but merely difficult. Evidence for the Mahāsāṅghika origin of the Chinese Ekottara has been judged weak: this excludes the possibility of a reconstruction of the fourth century B.C. text, and means that our aim must be less ambitious. According to modern research, it would appear that the Sthaviravādin sect split into two groups somewhere around 240 B.C., during the reign of Aśoka Maurya.[19] One of these groups is the Sarvāstivāda; the other is probably to be identified with the Vibhajyavāda.[20] Our texts C4, Tb and S belong to the Mūlasarvāstivāda, an offshoot of the Sarvāstivāda;[21] P belongs to the other main group. Features shared by these two textual groups should, therefore, go back in time to at least 240 B.C. But what use is to be made of the remaining versions, of unknown provenance? Should one simply compare the Theravādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin versions and ignore the rest? This would be unwise, for it would give too much weight to the above principles of method and would give us no opportunity to test them. If the dates of the schisms and the relations among the sects are as we think they are, and if the sectarian textual traditions are entirely closed, this procecure might be acceptable; such confidence, however, is unwarranted, and it is more advisable at the present stage of research in the area to make full use of all available sources and to attempt to determine historical strata through the evidence thus provided.

---

[19] See Bareau's Conciles, pp. 112ff.

[20] Ibid. See also, Sectes, pp. 167ff.

[21] Sectes, pp. 153, 154.

At the same time, while weight of evidence for the antiquity of a given feature is determined in part by ascertaining how many versions attest the presence of that feature, a final judgement cannot be made simply by counting the number of versions that witness to one state of affairs, counting the witnesses to a contrary state of affairs, and comparing sums. Where the affiliation and ancestry of the texts is not known such a count will often say little about the ancient state of the text. This suggests the importance of entering into the sense and structure of the work to see if this helps to throw into relief the additions, omissions and developmental trends of the textual tradition. For this reason the themes and symbols of the text cannot entirely be left till Chapter Three of the thesis: they will be considered in the present chapter where it is helpful to our historical aims.

Determining what is early and what is late is a complicated business and no doubt involves a degree of subjectivity. I have tried to be flexible and eclectic in my approach. The attempt has been made to avoid the rigid application of principles such as that which would have the shortness and simplicity of a given passage a guarantee of its antiquity. That shortness and simplicity are in the following analysis judged frequently to be associated with antiquity is undeniable, but I hope it will be seen that in such cases other factors have also been taken into consideration. Of great importance here are the precise relations pertaining among the different versions. These sometimes permit a hypothetical ordering of passages from the oldest to the most recent, with the stages of development and a rationale for it clearly visible.

One common rationale for the lengthening of texts is the exaltation (or "divinization") of the Buddha. Suppose, for example, passage "A" handles an incident involving the Buddha in such a way as to suggest that he is essentilaly a human being, albeit an outstanding one, while the parallel passage "B" in another version is at pains to exalt him beyond the human condition, to free him from human limitations. Does this indicate that passage "B" is, in its present form, later? Might it not, for example, simply indicate a difference in sect, or a difference in the type of reciter of the text, or a difference in the audience to its recitation? Here it must be said that while there are many cases of glorification of the Buddha known to have occurred in Indian Buddhism during the period in question (from 500 B.C. to A.D. 500), there are few examples that can be given of the opposite process.[22] Certainly some sects (of which the Theravāda is an important example) were at particular stages of their development less enthusiastic about, and even downright suspicious of, various sorts of exaltation,[23] but this seems to have involved a conservative attitude of resistance to scriptural change rather than the actual suppression and removal of such tendencies in received texts. This being so, the odds are

---

[22]See Bareau's arguments against Demiéville, Conciles, p. 87. Bareau concludes by saying: "Du reste, les légendes ont presque toujours tendance à se charger de plus en plus d'éléments surnaturels et évoluent bien rarement, au contraire, dans le sens de la rationalisation. Il ne serait pas difficile d'en donner des preuves nombreuses." Examples in support of this will be found in the present chapter.

[23]The Kathāvatthu is a good example of a text that shows this kind of suspicion.

that passage "B" in the above example is, other things being equal, later than passage "A". The other factors mentioned above, such as the sect to which the work belongs, are important but should not lead to the evasion of the historical question. It may be granted that such factors have stimulated change and determined the form of the change, but there is nonetheless a lack of evidence to suggest that they commonly led to the specific type of change here at issue, namely the de-glorification of the Buddha.

As opposed to the "original text", I shall speak in this chapter of reconstructing the "ancient text". This expression will refer to the totality of the oldest individual parts that can be reconstructed through a comparative analysis of the sources at our disposal. It cannot directly be translated into historical terms, but it will generally refer to a state of the text at least as ancient as 240 B.C. The reconstruction may not lay before us a single, specific ancient text; insofar as the degree of antiquity reached by the analysis may vary from one section of the sutra to another, the result is likely to be a composite affair. While the reconstructed text is no doubt "original" relative to the particular versions here considered (that is, it is their common ancestor), the use of this expression can easily lead to misunderstanding. There is no reason to believe that the stage reached by our reconstruction is identical with the earliest form of the text ever in existence. Such a level of antiquity cannot be directly approached through the comparative textual method used in this thesis.

Mahāsāṅghika Evidence

There are two references to the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya. They are brief, but valuable. I give them in translation here so that they may conveniently be referred to later in the chapter.

A. The Buddha was residing in the city of Rājagṛha in the āmra grove of Jīvaka, as is told at length in the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra. Thereafter it came about that one of the monks had doubts as to whether or not the Discipline (i.e., the Prātimokṣa) ought to be recited before a king. Accordingly he went to the Buddha and put the matter to him. The Buddha replied: "A king is able to do harm"--and so on, as detailed in the previous section dealing with the brigand.[24]

B. The Buddha was residing in the city of Rājagṛha in the āmra grove of Jīvaka Kumāra. He preached the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra all night long to king Ajātaśatru. Meanwhile, Upananda, being utterly exhausted from listening so long, retired to his room to rest. Later in the night he arose, put clogs on his feet, and returned. He made such a great clatter that the elephants and horses, hearing it, were startled and cried out. When the king heard them he was frightened and returned at once to the city. The monks went and reported the matter to the World Honoured One. The Buddha said: 'Summon Upananda'. When he had come the Buddha asked him: 'Did you really do this?' He replied: 'I did'. The Buddha said: 'From this day on the wearing of clogs is forbidden'.[25]

---

[24]T.1425: vol. 22, p. 447c. One is not supposed to recite the Prātimokṣa in such cases, but should instead recite some edifying discourses.

[25]Ibid., p. 482a-b. "Upananda" is a guess; the Chinese is Yu-po-nan-t'o 優波難陀.

Comparative Analysis

The sutra will be discussed according to the following divisions:

1. Opening Formula
2. Beginning of the Narrative (from the introduction of king Ajātaśatru to his acceptance of Jīvaka's suggestion)
3. Journey to the Buddha
4. Meeting of the King and the Buddha
5. The King's Question and the Buddha's Response
6. The Visits to the Six Heretics
7. The Buddha's Discourse
8. Outcome and Conclusion
9. Closing Formula

Opening formula

The opening lines of a sutra of the canon of Small Vehicle Buddhism customarily give the place where the Buddha was residing at the time in question; sometimes they give in addition the number of monks accompanying him. There is no reason to expect that these locations would be accurately preserved, and in fact we often find disagreements among the canons of the various sects.[26] In the present case, however, every version places the action in the city of Rājagṛha, in Jīvaka's mango grove. Further, all versions except M[27] mention the number of

---

[26]See Histoire, p. 171, and Chau, The Chinese Madhyama Āgama and the Pāli Majjhima Nikāya, (Saigon: Saigon Inst. of Higher Buddhist Studies, 1964), pp. 52ff.

[27]"M" = Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya version. This abbreviation will be used when there is no disagreement among C4, Tb and S. When there are differences the versions will be referred to separately.

monks and agree on a figure of twelve hundred and fifty; M confirms this number later in the story.

The agreement on the location is not really surprising. Ajātaśatru, king of Magadha, is essential to the story and he resided in Rājagṛha, the chief city of Magadha. Jīvaka is likewise important to the story and it would be easy to remember to locate the Buddha in his mango grove. (It is worth noting that while Rājagṛha is a very common setting for the Buddha's discourses, Jīvaka's mango grove is not.)[28]

The mention of twelve hundred and fifty monks is interesting. In the Chinese Dīrgha, to which C1 belongs, this is not remarkable, for it is standard in this collection to have the Buddha accompanied by this number of monks; but within the Pali Canon and the Chinese Ekottara to which P and C3 belong respectively, this number is rare, the usual figure being five hundred.[29]

It is fair to conclude that the ancient text had the Buddha staying in Rājagṛha, in Jīvaka's mango grove, accompanied by an unusually large assemblage of twelve hundred and fifty monks.

---

[28]See MN II, 368 for another instance of this rare setting. Veṇuvana and Gṛdhrakūṭa are more common settings in Rājagṛha.
It will be seen from the Mahāsāṅghika passages quoted on p. 117 that this sect is in agreement on the location.

[29]This is the only instance in the Dīgha Nikaya where there are twelve hundred and fifty monks; elsewhere, where the number is mentioned it is always five hundred. There are twelve hundred and fifty monks in only one case in the Majjhima (MN III, 147), in which collection the number of monks in attendance is in any case hardly ever mentioned. Although I have not made a thorough study of the remainder of the Pali Canon I believe that a figure of five hundred is everywhere more common than that of twelve hundred and fifty.
As to the Chinese Ekottara, there are often five hundred monks, but only on three occasions outside of our sutra are there twelve hundred and fifty. (T.125: vol. 2, pp. 660a, 773c, 806c)

In the Opening Formula, M and C3 have unique features. M lacks reference to the number of monks, as well as to the introductory "thus have I heard". C3 has an extra line asserting the arhatship of all the monks with the exception of Ānanda. The omissions in M are likely attributable to the need to fit the text smoothly into its present setting. Both features in question are characteristic of the formal beginning of a sutra: they would be out of place in a vinaya text on the one hand, and disruptive of the flow of the narrative (the story of Devadatta) on the other hand. C3's addition is not so easily explained. This phrase can be found in the opening portion of Mahāyāna sutras but is rare in the canon of Small Vehicle Buddhism.[30] All one can do in the present case is suggest Mahāyāna influence.

Beginning of the narrative

The king Ajātaśatru is first introduced. P and M specify that he is on the terrace of his palace,[31] but the other versions do not mention this. It is quite possible that this detail was part of the ancient text, although there is no ready explanation for its omission

---

[30]For a Mahāyāna example, see Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, ed. P. L. Vaidya (Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1960), p. 1. In the Chinese Ekottara this phrase is found in the opening lines of only one sutra in addition to ours: T.125: vol. 2, pp. 708-709.

[31]P: uparipāsādavaragato (DN I, 47). C4:在高樓上 (T.1450: vol. 24, p. 205a, 11-12). Tb: steṅ-gi khaṅ-bzaṅs-kyi bźir soṅ-nas. Peking Kanjur, vol. Ce (95), fol. 238a, 5-6 (Otani Reprint, vol. 42, p. 123).

in the other versions. The location given here is not unique to this context, but is fairly common: we shall find that such formulae are frequently shifted around in the textual tradition, being inserted and omitted here and there rather freely.[32]

There is disagreement on the time of the events. According to P they took place on the *poṣadha* of the fifteenth day, at the end of a four month period, on the day of the full moon, on the day called *Komudī*.[33] This apparently refers to the last day of the eighth lunar month (*Kārttika*).[34] C1 says simply that it is the fifteenth day, the day of the full moon.[35] C2 is quite careful to give the time as the fifteenth day of the seventh month, which marks the end of the summer retreat and the beginning of the new religious year.[36] At the end of this version the king invites the Buddha to spend the summer's retreat in Rājagṛha: we can only assume he is referring to the next

---

[32] For this particular formula, see DN I, 112 and 128.

[33] That is, it is not the fifteenth day of the month, but of the second half-month (*pakṣa*) wherein the moon is waxing, the month being counted from full moon to full moon. It is equivalent, therefore, to the thirtieth day of the month.

[34] This means that the four month period from *Śrāvaṇa* to *Kārttika* is concluded and that from *Mārgaśīrṣa* to *Phālguna* is introduced. Rhys Davids' comments (*Dialogues* I, 66, n. 1) are confusing: I do not see how the passage in question implies that for the Buddhists the year began in *Śrāvaṇa*.

[35] 十五日月滿時. T.1: vol. 1, p. 107a, 21.

[36] 時王阿闍世七月十五日過新歲臘. T.22: vol. 1, p. 271a, 2-3. Again this must mean the fifteenth day of the half-month.

retreat, nine months later. C3 agrees completely with C2 on the time of the event. C4 and Tb agree that the summer retreat (varṣāvāsa) is about to begin; C4, however, specifies this as the full moon fifteenth of the fifth month (that is, the last day of Śrāvaṇa), while Tb apparently wishes it to be the full moon fifteenth of the fourth month (Āṣāḍha).[37] Both dates make sense. The standard Buddhist retreat as described in most of the Vinayas stretches from the first day of the fifth month to the last day of the seventh month, ritual preparations being made on the last day of the fourth month.[38] It seems, however, that at least some branches of the Mūlasarvāstivāda considered the standard retreat to begin one month later than that adhered to by the other sects.[39]

In any case, we seem to have two main traditions as to the date of these events. The first (P, C2, C3) puts the date late in the year, at the end of the summer retreat;[40] the second (C4, Tb) puts it earlier in the year, at the beginning of the retreat. There is no

---

[37] C4: 五月十五日夜將安居. T.1450: vol. 24, p. 205a, 10. Tb: dbyar-zla-'briṅ-po. Peking Kanjur, vol. Ce, fol. 238a, 5 (Otani Reprint, vol. 42, p. 123).

[38] For the rules and dates of the retreat in the various Vinayas see Mahāvagga, 137ff. (Theravāda); T.1421: vol. 22, pp. 129ff. (Mahīśāsaka); T.1428: vol. 22, pp. 830ff. (Dharmaguptaka); T.1435: vol. 23, 173ff. (Sarvāstivāda); T.1445: vol. 23, pp. 1041ff. (Mūlasarvāstivāda).

[39] See T.1445: vol. 23, p. 1041b, 10ff. It is important to note that we are here concerned with the standard Buddhist retreat. Many sects included a retreat that began one month later than the standard retreat but this is not what is at issue here.

[40] P does not, however, actually say that it is at the end of the retreat, and it would be so only if it was a case of the later (non-standard) form of varṣāvasa.

way of deciding which is more ancient, although the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition is outnumbered. One thing at least is certain: the ancient text placed the events on the poṣadha of the full moon on the fifteenth day. All versions agree on this, even C1, and the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya lends some support as well.[41]

In P the king next gives an udāna (an expression of praise or joy) on the subject of the beauty of the moonlit night. While the king remarks on the beauty of the night in most versions (all except C2), P's udāna is not fully represented elsewhere. C4 has a somewhat similar statement but, curiously, this is not found in Tb, which instead compares the moon to the sun, like C1. In addition, the formal expression "udānaṃ udānesi" occurs only in P. It seems that while some praise of the night was certainly present in the ancient text, possibly incorporating a portion of the Pali udāna, the full and formal udāna given in P was not present, but is a later addition to this particular tradition.

As can be seen at a glance, there are large disagreements among our texts in the section dealing with the suggestions put to the king. It may be convenient to begin with the question the king puts to his company, for it is here that the differences begin.

In P he asks what śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa he should visit in order that his mind might attain peace (or "joy, faith").[42] In C2 he states

---

[41]Mahāsāṅghika passage A quoted above, p. 117 occurs in a section in this Vinaya dealing with poṣadha day, and it is evident that the events in question were assumed to have taken place at this time.

[42]"Kaṃ nu khvajja samaṇaṃ vā brāhmaṇaṃ vā payirupāseyyāma, yaṃ no payirupāsato cittaṃ pasīdeyyā" ti. DN I, 47.

more explicitly that his mind is not now at peace, but is overcome with anxiety; he wishes to know what, in general, he can do to get rid of this anxiety. There is no mention of visiting śramaṇas or brāhmaṇas. In all other versions the king merely asks what he should do on this fine moonlit night.

P stands, therefore, quite alone in its specificity. C2 appears to be somewhat closer to it than are the remaining versions. Let us consider the next section, dealing with the replies to the question, before making decisions as to the relative antiquity of these alternate forms.

A consideration of the suggestions put to the king shows that P again is rather unique, being confronted in its brevity by a group of more or less longer and more complicated statements. In P there are six suggestions, excluding that made by Jīvaka (which will be considered separately). Each is made by "a certain king's councillor" (aññataro rājāmacco).[43] Each one of these ministers recommends one of the six heretics, each of the latter getting, therefore, a separate and full recommendation. And yet this is in appearance only, for the recommendations are word for word identical. If we were to exclude the repetition from this section, the episode would be brief indeed. In C2, the speech recommending the six heretics is much shorter than that found in P and is given only once. Instead of requiring six ministers, this version finds it necessary to employ for this purpose only one, who recommends all six teachers. We note that the fact that the heretics are not

---

[43]DN I, 47f.

distinguished as to their accomplishments brings C2 close to P, even while the two versions may appear formally different. C2, however, has three ministers give their suggestions prior to the one just mentioned, and these suggestions have nothing to do with the six heretics. The first minister recommends indulgence in the five sense pleasures, the second dance and song, and the third a military expedition. In full, therefore, there are four ministers recommending four alternatives, which are designed in this version of the story to dispel the king's anxiety. With regard to this section, C2 occupies a very interesting position among the available texts, for on the one hand its three secular recommendations indicate a strong connection with the versions other than P, whereas on the other hand the fact that all recommendations are made by anonymous ministers reveals ties between it and P.

In M it is again anonymous councillors of the king who recommend the heretical teachers. M is closer to C2 than to P in so far as it does not repeat the recommendation separately for each teacher (Tb gives the formula twice, and C4 only once); yet, in the actual description of the heretics it is closer to P. The main difference between M and P, of course, is that the former, like C2, has the secular recommendations.[44] M and C2 are quite close in these recommendations, with the major difference that in C2 they are put forth by anonymous ministers whereas in M they are put forth by two of the king's ladies and Udāyi Bhadra.

---

[44]Although it is not clear from Rockhill's translation, Tb like C4 refers in the first and third recommendations to the five sense desires and the four-fold army respectively. This brings it quite close to C2. Interestingly, the separate parts of the four-fold army are listed in Tb (as in C2) but not in C4.

A glance at C1 and C3 shows that they are closely related at this point. Although the differences between them are sufficient to indicate a considerable period of separate development, there is nonetheless no doubt but that they stem from a common source which was distinct from, although related to, the other versions. The main distinguishing factor of this source is its giving of specific names to the members of the king's court who recommend the six heretics. Presumably these people are meant to be rājāmacca as in the previous cases, but here they are not anonymous. C1 and C3 agree on the names of at least three of these people (Varṣakāra, Sunidha, Abhayarājakumāra) and probably on several more, although failure to identify the remaining members renders this uncertain.[45] They agree also in having only one woman involved in the secular recommendations, as opposed to M which has two.

How are we to interpret the above facts in terms of historical development? The simplest explanation is that P is the closest to the ancient text and that the stages of development are roughly indicated by the order of discussion adopted above, viz. P, C2, M, C1-C3. This may seem a perverse judgement, since one's first impression is apt to be that P's witness is greatly outnumbered by the witnesses for the longer version. As will be seen from the above discussion, however, there is really no single longer version, but several, which are more or

---

[45]Note, however, that there is little if any agreement on the matter of which person recommends which heretical teacher.

less longer than P but not identical with each other. It is a careful consideration of the relationships among these that leads me to the above conclusion. More precisely, I would describe the stages of the text's development as follows:

(1) In the most ancient version there are only councillors in attendance on the king, as in P. The king wishes on this poṣadha day to visit a religious leader so that he may attain peace of mind; hence he asks those around him what śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa he should visit. The replies to this question fall into two parts: the recommendation of the heretical teachers, and the recommendation of the Buddha by Jīvaka. Both involve recommendations that the king pay honour to a religious leader, but whereas the heretics are misguided and unworthy the Buddha is by contrast a proper object of honour. The recommendations of the former serve to highlight and define the latter. The heretics are at this point in the text's development distinguished by name but not by description, for they represent fundamentally one possibility, that of incorrect religion. (Whether or not the most ancient version had, like P, the repetition of the description of the heretics is uncertain and probably unimportant.) Further, the councillors are not in reality distinct individuals: they have a purely formal function in introducing the heretical teachers, and there are six of them simply because there are six teachers to be recommended.

(2) The next stage of the text is seen in C2. Again the king is surrounded by anonymous councillors. Again his problem is one of attaining peace of mind, but here the question he puts to his attendants is somewhat broader than previously. "With what expedient can I dispel

this dread?" he asks. The question is thus suited to inviting other possibilities than strictly religious ones. In keeping with this, three new suggestions are added involving secular activities. The activities are those deemed appropriate to a king, namely indulgence in sensual and aesthetic pleasure and indulgence in warfare. This change in the text is certainly effective for it permits a three-fold gradation of possibilities somewhat richer than the previous two-fold structure. We now have secular activities, misguided religious activities, and enlightened or correct religious activities. Just as the presentation of the heretical teachers prepares for the presentation of the Buddha, the new secular suggestions prepare for the religious suggestions.

(3) The next stage is represented, more or less, by M. Here the king is surrounded by a mixed retinue representing a variety of interests and possibilities. And of them he asks a very general question: "What shall I do?"[46] In effect, the sutra now opens with the question: "What should one do?" Should one betake oneself to pleasures of the senses and to dominance of the world; or to the various disputatious philosophers; or to the Buddha? Both the question and the answers to it are, in their generality, now relevant to anyone who might hear the sutra. And the ensuing action is lifted out of its frame in time and space.

An additional change is made at this stage of the text, easy to effect yet of considerable worth. The first few councillors, those

---

[46]Tb: N̄as ci-źig bya? Peking Kanjur, vol. Ce, fol. 238a, 6 (Otani Reprint, vol. 42, p. 123). C4, interpreting the royal "we" as a genuine plural, translates: "What shall you and I do?" (我及卿等欲何所作) T.1450: vol. 24, p. 205a, 13.

who suggest the secular activities, are transformed into a company consisting of several of the king's women plus his son Udāyi Bhadra. At the very least this adds some color to the narrative. More than this, however, it introduces characters who will play a role later in the story, the women accompanying the king on his journey to the Buddha and Udāyi Bhadra being referred to by the king in his initial remarks to the Buddha. It is particularly helpful to be shown Udāyi Bhadra's warlike proclivities since this makes Ajātaśatru's later reference to his son much less mysterious.

(4) Although there are some differences between C1 and C3, these versions may here be taken together as representing the next stage of development. As in M, the king is surrounded by a mixed company of whom he asks his general question; here, however, he asks his question again each time he turns to a new attendant, including invariably a comment on the brightness of the moon. In addition, each heretic receives his own recommendation. (In C1 the same recommendation is used each time, but in C3 they are genuinely distinct.) Lastly, those who recommend the heretical teachers are given specific names and identities.

The effect of these changes is to lengthen this section of the text considerably while adding nothing to it thematically. It would have been easy enough to find names for those in attendance on the king from among the group of people associated with the court of Magadha, but it is debatable whether or not this improves the narrative. This much, however, can be said for the change: it increases the suspense and sharpens the contrast with the next section dealing with Jīvaka's

suggestion. Those hearing the sutra would know that it was Jīvaka, a well known disciple of the Buddha and in whose mango grove the Buddha was staying at this time, who knew whom the king really ought to visit; yet throughout the noise and bustle of the attendants, each anxious to make his suggestion at length, Jīvaka remains silent. Jīvaka's silence, as will later be seen, is thematically important to the sutra.

In objection to this hypothesis of textual development one might raise a number of questions. The following two would probably be the most important. How does one explain features common to early and late versions but missing from the intermediary stages? And, cannot the whole process be better explained as working in the reverse direction, from length and detail to brevity and simplicity?

In answering the first question I must point out that I do not interpret the versions of the text discussed above as identical with the relevant stages, but as representing them with varying degrees of accuracy. It would be most unusual if this handful of texts, whose survival has been a matter of chance, could be put with perfect neatness into a developmental scheme. If C2 were the direct ancestor of M it would indeed be difficult to explain how the descriptions of the heretics in P and M share elements lacking in C2. But it is possible that C2 dropped these particular elements during the course of time while nonetheless remaining generally true to a version of the text more primitive than, and ancestral to, M. Again, it may seem odd that there should be a full repetition of the description of the heretics only in the earliest version (P) and in the latest version (C1-C3). Yet I doubt if this is a serious objection. There seems to have been considerable

flexibility within the process of transmission on the matter of how much material was to be repeated. It is interesting that Rhys Davids, Franke and Neumann, all engaged in producing accurate translations, uniformly decline to repeat the recommendations in full even though the repetition occurs in the Pali.[47] More to the point, if we compare the two versions from the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya we find that there are significant differences in the amount of material repeated.[48] If such variability existed within one sect we should not be surprised at the considerable differences among our texts in this regard.

The second question is more difficult to answer. There are three procedures, however, that may offer help. First, one looks for actual evidence of change in the texts, whether of omission or deletion. Second, one asks which version makes better sense in the context. Third, one asks whether there is any rationale for the proposed type of change.

So far as I can see, there is no evidence of omission in P. That the secular recommendations to the king were omitted is of course possible, but if this is the case the omission has been clean and thorough. If one looks at C1, however, one notices a curious situation. Initially the king asks his attendants what he should do on this moonlit night; then, without explanation or apparent cause, after the secular recommenda-

---

[47]Rhys Davids, for example, translates the recommendation passage once, and then says: "Then other five ministers spake in the same terms..." (Dialogues, I, p. 66).

[48]Tb has the recommendation in full twice; C4 has it only once.

tions have been given, he changes the form of his question to: "What śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa could I approach that would be able to enlighten my mind?"[49] This second form of the question is virtually identical with that found in P. I believe that this is a survival in Cl of the ancient form of the question and that the point in the text at which the form of the question changes is precisely at the dividing line between the older section, which dealt exclusively with the six heretics, and the more recent section dealing with the secular activities.

As to which version makes better sense, it is well to consider further the differences in the question the king puts to those around him. Now, the longer and more specific form of the question, that found in P, is actually tied to the shorter version of the section as a whole since it precludes reference to the secular activities that figure prominently elsewhere. One might be tempted to argue that the situation presented in the versions other than P is more natural and believable. The king, favored with a beautiful night of the full moon, asks what he should do to take advantage of it, and receives a variety of possibilities in reply. Does this not make more sense than that he should ask, as in P, the very specific question: "What śramaṇa or brāhmana should I visit?" Not so. It has to be kept in mind that these events took place, as all versions agree, on poṣadha day. In this connection it is here worth consulting the account of the initial adoption of the poṣadha

---

[49] 當詣何等沙門婆羅門所能開悟我心.
T.1: vol. 1, p. 107b, 7ff.

observance by the Buddhist community. The account as found in the Pali Vinaya begins as follows:

> At that time the Lord Buddha was sojourning in Rājagaha, at Mt. Gijjhakūṭa. And at that time the ascetics of other sects used to assemble and preach dhamma on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month. And people would go to them in order to hear dhamma, and would gain affection for and faith in these ascetics of other sects, who would thus gain a following.[50]

Thereafter it occurs to the king of Magadha, Bimbisāra, that it would be well if the Buddhists were to do likewise, and having approached the Buddha he makes this suggestion. The Buddha accepts his suggestion and says: "I permit you, Monks, to assemble on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month".[51] In this account there are two points of special interest. First, the custom of poṣadha is said to have been adopted by the Buddhists from other sects of the time: hence there is nothing unnatural in the suggestion that Ajātaśatru visit non-Buddhist leaders on this day.[52] Second, poṣadha is described as an occasion for

---

[50]Tena kho pana samayena Buddho Bhagavā Rājagahe viharati Gijjhakūṭe pabbate. Tena kho pana samayena aññatitthiyā paribbājakā cātuddase pannarase aṭṭhamiyā ca pakkhassa sannipatitvā dhammaṃ bhāsanti. Te manussā upasaṅkamanti dhammassavanāya. Te labhanti annatitthiyesu paribbājakesu pemaṃ, labhanti pasādaṃ, labhanti aññatitthiyā paribbājakā pakkhaṃ. Mahāvagga, 101.

The accounts in the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka Vinayas are substantially the same; those in the other Vinayas are generally quite different.

[51]Mahāvagga, 102.

[52]It is of course common in the Vinaya for Buddhist practices to be explained as having been initially adopted from other śramaṇa sects of the time. But in many cases this explanation is probably correct. The Jains certainly had poṣadha, and on the same days as those given above, although I do not know when they first adopted the practice. See, for example, H. Jacobi's translation of the Sūtrakṛtāṅga, Jaina Sūtras, Part II, Sacred Books of the East , XLV (Reprinted, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1968), p. 383.

religious leaders to preach and laymen to hear, and for these leaders to win over their hearers to their own party. As well as reinforcing our conclusion that it would have been very natural for Ajātaśatru to want to visit religious teachers on this day, this explains the rivalry among the king's councillors, each of whom belongs to a particular sect already and wants to win the king's adherence.[53] In light of this passage, therefore, the form of the king's question found in P makes a great deal of sense. And the proposals made to the king in the other versions, such as that he conduct a military expedition on this day, become correspondingly less convincing.

As to rationale for textual change, the developmental scheme outlined earlier should serve to show the sorts of motivation at work in lengthening the section. It is not in any direct sense a case of exalting the Buddha, but neither are the additions to be dismissed as empty "elaboration". There are sound literary grounds for many of the textual changes, and in addition several have the important function of widening the scope and purpose of the sutra, enabling it to speak to a broader audience and a broader range of problems.

The developmental scheme proposed above, therefore, seems to be generally accurate.

---

[53]Worthy of note is the fact that some of the Vinaya traditions, such as the Pali one referred to above, picture the heretical teachers and their assemblies holding posadha in Rājagṛha. Indeed, they give Ajātaśatru's father, Bimbisāra, a role in the Buddhist adoption of this practice.

The next incident in this section is the introduction of Jīvaka to the story. In P, M, C2 and C3 he is introduced with some such words as: "At that time Jīvaka was standing near the king." Only C1 lacks this. By simple weight of evidence we conclude that it was present in the ancient text. Beyond this, P, M and C2 make reference, either through the narrator (P) or through the king's speech (P, M, C2) to Jīvaka's silence up to this point. That C1 and C3 are the only versions to neglect this confirms our earlier finding that there is a special relation between these texts, at least in this section. I suspect that C1 and C3 again stand at a position late in the development of the text. What seems to be happening is that through the extension of previous formulae to the Jīvaka section without alteration, Jīvaka is being progressively incorporated into the king's company, his uniqueness blurred. For example, in these versions the king makes his remark on the clarity and brightness of the moon before addressing Jīvaka, just as he has previously done before addressing the rest of the retinue. This process reaches its culmination in C1 where, as noted above, Jīvaka is not introduced at all, but treated precisely like the rest of the company. Structurally this is not an improvement. In the earlier versions Jīvaka is neatly set off from the rest of the company by a number of devices, the most important of which is the reference to his silence. In the C1-C3 version this contrast is lost, and a major turning point of the section weakened. The shift from misguided to valid religion is obscured.

All versions agree on the substance of Jīvaka's reply: the Buddha is presently staying in his mango grove, and the king ought to go there and pay him honour. Beyond this, however, agreements are few. Tb is unique in that it has Jīvaka recommend the Buddha in very

nearly the same terms as those whereby the heretical teachers were recommended. Elsewhere there is always a significant difference in the terms whereby the Buddha is presented for the king's consideration. The reason is obvious. Everything hinges on the distinction between the Buddha and the heretics, and it is highly desirable that Jīvaka, himself distinguished from the rest of the company, portray the Buddha in terms that do him justice. That Tb's treatment of the passage does not reflect the ancient text is shown by the fact that its Mūlasarvāstivādin cousin C4, in agreement with the other versions, lays stress on the Buddha's uniqueness. Excluding Tb, the witnesses may be divided into two groups: those that present the Buddha in simple terms (C1, C2) and those that include several lines of praise (P, C3, C4). But there is no agreement among the latter three as to the details of the praise. C3 and C4 are apparently rather creative, while P simply inserts the very common formula describing a Buddha. If this formula is removed (and it is not attested here in any other version) we are left essentially with the simple statement found in C1 and C2. It may be concluded, therefore, that the simple version is the most ancient, and that the natural tendency to praise the Buddha at this point in the story has resulted in the differences found.

The following facts regarding the king's reply and Jīvaka's outfitting of the elephants are agreed upon by virtually all texts. The king consents to visit the Buddha and orders Jīvaka to make preparations; the latter accordingly has five hundred elephants made ready upon which five hundred women are seated, and in addition prepares the king's riding elephant.

That the elephants the women ride were female (cow) elephants in the ancient text is likely, this being attested by P, C1, and Tb, and obliquely by C3. It is likewise clear that the king himself rode a male (bull) elephant. It is uncertain whether the ancient text said that the women held the torches, whether it was the attendants that held them, or whether this was left unspecified. C1 and M state that the women hold them; the other versions are ambiguous. Rhys Davids' "the attendants bearing torches"[54] is interpretive. The Pali text does not mention attendants, saying only "torches being held" (ukkāsu dhāriyamānāsu).[55] Lastly, it may be that the ancient text specified that the king went forth in great majesty, as P says (mahaccā rājānubhāvena)[56] and as is attested by C1 and possibly C4.

The most noteworthy feature of this section is that it is here that C3 begins to differ widely from all other versions, showing itself so idiosyncratic from this point on that it becomes difficult to include it in our comparative analysis. If the question be raised whether the material in this section unique to C3 belonged to the ancient text, we can only reply that there is no reason whatsoever to think so. The gāthās are certainly appropriate to the setting, but their existence is not even hinted at by any other text. In addition to being the result of a creative literary outburst they appear to have an elucidative aim, for

---

[54] Dialogues, I, p. 67.

[55] DN I, 49.

[56] Ibid.

they make mention of both Bimbisāra and Devadatta and explain both the king's hesitation and Jīvaka's enthusiasm with regard to the proposed visit to the Buddha.

Journey to the Buddha

The facts agreed upon by nearly all versions are as follows. During the journey the king is struck with fear, terrified that he is being led into an ambush. His fear comes from his hearing no sound from the large company of monks supposed to be residing in the mango grove. He asks Jīvaka if he has treacherous intentions and Jīvaka reassures him, after which they reach the grove. In the various accounts of these incidents there are a few differences that merit recording.

In C2 and M the king asks Jīvaka how many monks there are in the grove and receives the reply that there are twelve hundred and fifty. In the other versions he apparently already knows the number. I see no way of deciding whether or not this question belonged to the ancient text, but in any case it has the obvious purpose of emphasizing the contrast between the great number of people and their utter silence; it also underlines the king's incredulity and confused state of mind. These features are of importance to the sutra.

C2's reference to the din made by non-Buddhist assemblies of as few as five hundred people is unique to this version and was certainly not part of the ancient text. It represents an attempt to contrast the silence (hence true religiosity) of the Buddhist assembly with the noise and disorder (hence false religiosity) of the heretic assemblies.

The symbolism employed here is typical of the sutra, but it is used here so baldly and artificially as to be ineffective from the literary point of view.

Tb's reference to the king's strained relations with the Vṛjjis is not attested elsewhere, even in C4. It cannot have been part of the ancient text. It is, however, explanatory to the reader as well as being historically accurate.

In the accounts of Jīvaka's reassurance of the king every version except P includes a reason for the noiselessness of the assembly, which is everywhere much the same: the Buddha delights in silence. In his commentary on this passage Buddhaghosa, explaining why the king is travelling without noise and fanfare, says: "When Jīvaka was on the terrace of the palace he had said: 'Great king, the Lord delights in little noise and hence with little noise must be approached'."[57] It is difficult to know how to interpret this, but it is possible that Buddhaghosa was aware of a version that included the statement appa-sadda-kāmo Bhagavā ("the Lord delights in little noise") at this point in the text. And it may be that the ancient version included this and that it was dropped in P.

Tb and C4 are significantly different in the details of Jīvaka's reply, but it would appear that each is indulging in an expansion of an earlier version that referred but briefly to the Buddha's love of silence. Tb's reference to the lamps of the pavilion is supported by P, although

---

[57]Jīvako kir'assa upari-pāsāde yeva ārocesi, 'Mahārāja, appa-sadda-kāmo Bhagavā, appa-sadden' eva upasaṃkamitabbo' ti. Sumaṅgala, 150.

whether or not this detail was present anciently is not entirely certain for it is not directly confirmed in the other texts.

Meeting of the King and the Buddha

The agreed facts are as follows. The king arrives at the pavilion, dismounts and enters on foot. He asks Jīvaka where the Buddha is and Jīvaka tells him. The king remarks on the stillness of the Buddha's assembly and wishes aloud that his son Udāyi Bhadra had such peace. The Buddha welcomes him and bids him be seated.[58]

Generally speaking, P is the most brief and spare in its reporting of these facts. An examination of the other versions shows that not only are they longer, but their additional material has a guiding purpose, that of exalting the Buddha.

As will be discussed later in this thesis, the meeting of Ajātaśatru with the Buddha is envisaged as a meeting between two types of king, two types of master. Ajātaśatru is master of the external realm and the Buddha master of the internal realm. It is hence interesting to see how the different traditions deal with this crucial meeting. Let us compare in this regard P and C1.

In P the king, having reached the gateway to the pavilion, asks Jīvaka where the Buddha is. The reply is: "That is the Lord, Great King! That is the Lord, Great King--seated against the middle

[58]Note, however, that C4 lacks the question "Where is the Buddha?", and C2 is badly corrupt in the Udayi Bhadra section.

pillar facing East in front of the assembly of monks".[59] Then without further ado the king approaches the Buddha and addresses him.

In C1, before entering the pavilion the king removes the five royal insignia. The symbolism is clear and powerful. He is entering the realm of the śramaṇas, who have "put down the sword":[60] hence he puts down his. He is divesting himself of his own royalty as he leaves the circle of his mastery and enters the circle wherein the Buddha is king. P's reference to the Buddha "seated against the middle pillar facing East" is not rich symbolically. To be sure, the East is auspicious in India,[61] and no doubt one could make something of the fact that it is the middle pillar the Buddha sits against; nevertheless, it is hardly a strong symbolic statement. By contrast, C1 has the Buddha seated on high on the Lion Seat (師子座 = siṃhāsana), which is of course a throne.[62] Before reaching him Ajātaśatru not only has to ascend but also to wash his feet. In his divestiture of the insignia the king has left behond his kingship; once inside the pavilion he is made to acknowledge the kingship of the Buddha.

---

[59] Eso, Mahārāja, Bhagavā; eso, Mahārāja, Bhagavā majjhimaṃ thambhaṃ nissāya puratthābhimukho nisinno, purakkhato bhikkhusaṅghassā ti. DN I, 50.

[60] Nihitasattha. A standard term used to describe the moral behavior of the śramaṇa. See, for example, DN I, 63.

[61] Note also that facing East may imply royalty, since Indian thrones were sometimes oriented thus. See Jeannine Auboyer, Le Trône et son symbolisme dans l'Inde ancienne (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1949), p. 60.

[62] Ibid., p. 8 and throughout.

It is curious that C1 has the Buddha face South. Since the South is generally inauspicious in India this is problematic. The problem is solved, however, when we realize that in China the Emperor is always made to face South; indeed, the phrase "to sit facing South" (南面而坐)[63] used in C1 has in Chinese the meaning "to reign as Emperor". This would appear, therefore, to be one of those cases, very rare in our texts, where the translator has taken the liberty of making an alteration in keeping with the customs familiar to his Chinese readers. One cannot deny that it admirably completes the image. As for the actual reading in the Indian text in question, it was probably "facing East" as attested by P.

An examination of this passage in the other versions shows that there was a general tendency to exalt the Buddha but little agreement on the details whereby this was to be accomplished. The obvious conclusion is that P, which has little of this material, is here the closest to the ancient text.

A case of agreement on this exaltation material is where C1 and C2 concur in having the king discard the five royal insignia. While this agreement may indicate a special relation between these two texts, it is doubtful if it points to a feature of the ancient text. First, neither the Theravādin nor the Mūlasarvāstivādin texts have this detail; second, the custom of divestiture of the insignia,

---

[63]T.1: vol. 1, p. 108a, 6.

rare in the Pali Canon, is common in the Chinese āgamas.[64] It seems that it came into favor at some stage of the tradition and was subsequently introduced into the sutras where deemed appropriate.

A further interesting case of exaltation material is the ascription of radiance to the Buddha. This is attested, although in very different terms, by C2 and C3. In Buddhaghosa's commentary, stress is laid (at the same point in the story) on the glorious radiance of the Buddha, which is said to illumine the entire grove.[65] Although we must judge that the reference to radiance is not part of the ancient text (due to its absence in most versions and to its very different forms in the texts in which it occurs), it is possible that Buddhaghosa was familiar with traditions that inserted it at this point in the story. And, whether this is so or not, it is a very important symbol, which will be explored in the next chapter.

A fascinating element of this section is the question the king asks Jīvaka: "Where is the Buddha?" That this was part of the ancient text is certain, it being attested by every version but C4. For devout Buddhists in later times this prosaic question would be shocking. That the Buddha would not have stood out in a very obvious

---

[64] I know of no sutra passage in the Pali Canon where all five insignia are discarded by a king. See MN II, 119, however, for what seems to be an early stage in the development of the five-fold scheme. For instances of the full scheme in the Chinese Madhyama, see T.26: vol. 1, p. 519a, 8 and ibid., p. 795c, 12-13. For the Chinese Ekottara, see, for example, T.125: vol. 2, p. 679b, 9.

[65] Sumaṅgala, 151-152.

way from those around him would have been felt incredible. And in fact it is found that in most versions the exaltation of the Buddha has rendered this question senseless. If the Lord were seated on high on a throne, or encircled with radiance, would the king need to ask where he was? No better proof could be desired for the claim that the exaltation material was not part of the ancient text, for while the question itself is ancient the material that renders it senseless cannot be.[66]

Next comes the king's remark about his son Udāyi Bhadra. This episode was part of the ancient text, for it is attested by all versions, even the corrupt C2. In most versions it is an abrupt introduction to Udāyi Bhadra, but in C1 and C3 we have been somewhat prepared for him by his introduction in the earlier section. The king's prayer for his son is everywhere much the same: May he attain peace such as is possessed by this company of monks. The lake image used in P to describe the assembly is attested by M (although Tb puts it in a rather different position).

The King's question and the Buddha's response

The facts agreed upon here are as follows. After some formalities the king asks the Buddha a question. The Buddha asks the king in

---

[66]That the Theravādin tradition in the fifth century A.D. was no less prone to exaltation of the Buddha than the other sects can be seen by the way Buddhaghosa grapples in his commentary with Ajātaśatru's question (Sumaṅgala, 152--see translation below, p. 231). His solution is quaint, but we are left with the impression that he would have been happier with a less simple and austere text upon which to comment.

return if he has ever put this same question to anyone else. The king admits that he has and begins to recount his visits to the six heretics.

The preliminary formalities are simple enough (the king honours the Buddha and accepts a seat) except in C3. Two acts are here unique to this text. First, the king formally presents his title and receives recognition from the Buddha. This act is not unknown in other parts of the canon of Small Vehicle Buddhism, but it is here attested only by C3.[67] It has the effect of further humbling the king and exalting the Buddha, and is undoubtedly an addition to the text made by this particular tradition. Second, the king confesses his crime of patricide. The confession itself, as will be seen later, is an ancient feature of the sutra, but no other version places it here and there are good reasons for rejecting this as its original location. C3 itself repeats the confession later in the place where we expect it--after the dialogue with the Buddha--and this second placement is not only supported by all other versions but fits better with the sense of the ancient text. For the king is putting the Buddha to the test by asking him the same question he has asked other religious leaders, and the proper time to repent his sin is when the Buddha has proved himself, that is, when he has passed the test. In putting the confession before the discourse C3 is showing a later understanding of the situation, according to which the king already knows the Buddha's worth and goes to him expressly to ask forgiveness and take refuge with him.

---

[67]See, for example, MN II, 120.

The question Ajātaśatru asks is of course crucial, for it determines the drift of everything from this point on. Strangely, there are major differences in its formulation.

P and C1 are very close, occasionally corresponding word for word. The king's question as they present it is a good one and is very clearly expressed. Basically it is: Does the effort of the śramaṇa win present and visible reward as is the case with the occupational activity of ordinary people? While the forms of the question found in the other versions can be related to this one they are by no means identical with it. So far as I can tell, Tb's formulation of the question is harmonious with that of P and C1, but C4 asks instead: Do these people, engaging in this sort of everyday occupational activity, attain, here and now, the fruit appropriate to the śramaṇa?[68] C2, along with other idiosyncratic elements, shows in the first few formulations of its question a similar concern: Has one accomplished anything religiously by engaging in these sorts of secular activity? C3 asks a completely new question: If one in this present existence makes merit, will he receive present recompense? It is rather shocking to see the extent to which our texts disagree on this central question of the sutra.

It is difficult to believe that C3's formulation is that of the ancient text. As has already been seen, there is good evidence from a variety of sources (including Mahāsāṅghika) that the title of

---

[68] This is clearer in subsequent formulations of the question in C4.

the sutra from very early times was Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra. That the sutra was concerned in some sense with the fruit appropriate to a śramana is therefore hardly open to question.

Further, it is virtually certain that the point of the question in the ancient text was, as in P and C1, whether the śramaṇa could attain results as do people engaged in secular activities, rather than whether people engaged in secular occupations could win the fruits appropriate to the śramaṇa. Perhaps the most convincing argument for this is that all versions except C3 agree that when the Buddha answers the king's question every example he gives concerns the results attained by the person who has left home and become a śramaṇa: there is no question of anyone attaining the goal of a śramaṇa while engaged in secular activity.[69]

I would not presume to attempt an exact reconstruction of the details of the question, and perhaps it is not necessary. Minor examples of the relations among the texts in this regard are: P and C2 agree in mentioning the gifts to śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas that result in merit and good rebirth, while this is missing from C1; yet C1 and C2 agree in having slaves partake of the fruits of toil, as against P's "friends" (mittāmacca).[70] Neither of these elements is

---

[69]There is no question of this, in fact, even in C3. Note also that C2, confused and corrupt though it often is, has the Buddha conclude his discourse to the king with words that surely reflect the state of the question in the ancient text: "Your Majesty, this is the fruit, here and now, of the way of the śramaṇa."

[70]DN I, 51.

found in M. It is difficult to know what to make of this confusing situation.

The Buddha then asks the king if he has previously put this same question to others and the king replies that he has. All versions agree on this. In P there is then a brief formality whereby the Buddha asks the king to recount these conversations to him if it is not troublesome, and the king replies that it is not troublesome.[71] This is not found in any other version and there is no reason to believe it was part of the ancient text.

The visits to the six heretics[72]

A thorough comparative analysis of this section of the sutra would be very interesting and worthwhile. It is, however, beyond the scope of the present thesis. We shall here limit ourselves to trying to find answers to a few rudimentary questions, such as: What doctrines were included in the ancient text, and to whom where these doctrines attributed?

It is convenient to begin with the issue of the order of presentation of the heretical teachers. In C1, C2 and C3 the order in which they were initially presented in the "Beginning of the

---

[71] Ibid.

[72] For the doctrines of the six heretics in Tb, it is wise to refer to Vogel's edition and translation of the relevant parts of the Pravrajyāvastu in The Teachings of the Six Heretics. Rockhill's translation of this section is very unreliable.

Narrative" section is here exactly retained. For C1 and C2 the order is: P.K., M.G., A.K., K.K., S.V., N.J.[73] C3's order is the same except that A.K. precedes M.G. P's earlier order is identical with the order of C1 and C2, but in the present section (that is, in the actual detailed presentation of the doctrines of the six heretics) it reverses S.V. and N.J. Tb (and C4 as far as it goes) keeps to its earlier order (P.K., M.G., S.V., A.K., K.K., N.J.) except that it reverses K.K. and N.J. The question arises as to why P and M change their order of presentation.

It is obvious that there was a strong tradition that N.J. belonged last in the list of the six teachers. In all of the initial listings of the six heretics in the various versions of the sutra he occupies the final position. But if his rightful place is the final one what has caused it to be usurped in P and M? We notice that in both cases the doctrine that takes the place of N.J.'s is that of the prevaricator (identified in P as S.V. and in Tb as K.K.). And after the speech of this teacher the king reflects that of all the religious leaders he is surely the stupidest.[74] This remark has

---

[73]The abbreviations used are as follows:
P.K. = Pūraṇa Kāśyapa
M.G. = Maskarin Gośālīputra
A.K. = Ajita Keśakambalin
K.K. = Kakuda Kātyāyana
S.V. = Sañjayin Vairaṭīputra
N.J. = Nirgrantha Jñātiputra

[74]P: Ayaṃ ca imesaṃ samaṇabrāhmaṇānaṃ sabbabālo sabbamūḷho. DN I, 59. Tb reads quite similarly.

an obvious function from the literary point of view: it climaxes and concludes the king's interviews with the heretics. It further shows the king's anger and frustration with them, for they are all by implication dismissed as foolish and deluded. A corresponding statement may be found in all versions of the text except C1, which shows no trace of it. In C2 it comes after the third heretic discussed, who is the prevaricator in this version (and who is identified as A.K.).[75] In C3 the remark comes at the conclusion of all the speeches, directly after N.J. How does one make sense of this situation?

We may take it that the ancient text did include this disparaging remark. For it is attested by all versions but C1. Secondly, we may take it that it was meant to refer to the prevaricator. This is attested by P, M and C2, and in addition it makes a great deal of sense. It is the prevaricator whose speech is the least straightforward, the least helpful, and the least to the point in view of the king's question. Two things stand out then: the remark belongs to the prevaricator, and it belongs (for literary reasons) at the end of the section. These two conditions are satisfied by P and M. We conclude, therefore, that the prevaricator came last in the presentation of the heretical doctrines in the ancient text. The situation in C2 and C3 can be explained as involving corruptions of this ancient state of affairs:

---

[75]The remark is somewhat different here, but detailed inspection shows that it is a corruption of the forms found elsewhere. The reference to Rājagṛha ties it to Tb, which has a similar reference. The fact that C2 says that all the heretics are unenlightening is easily explained as a corruption of a reading such as that found in P (sabbabālo sabbamūlho).

C3 keeps the remark at the end of the discourse but forgets that it should follow the prevaricator (whose speech is in any case dropped entirely from C3); C2 has retained it after the prevaricator but forgotten to put the prevaricator last.

Our original question hence receives the following answer. While there is every reason to believe that in the original listing of the six heretics N.J. belonged last, at a distant stage of the text (and possibly from the time of its composition) the prevaricator was put last in the actual presentation of the doctrines, so that the section could be appropriately terminated with the king's remark as discussed above. In keeping to the initial order, C1, C2 and C3 are not therefore preserving a more ancient state of the text, as might first appear to be the case, but rather showing their confusion of the more ancient situation. Clearly, in these cases the force of tradition resulted in the order of the heretics in the presentation of their doctrines being made to agree with the order in their initial listing.

This seemingly trivial issue has enlightened us on several matters. For example, it seems likely that the prevaricator occupied the penultimate position in the initial listing of the heretical teachers in the text, so that only a slight shift in the order was necessary to have him come last in the detailed presentation. It would further follow that N.J. would come to occupy the penultimate position in the detailed presentation. This is what is found in P and M. In addition we discover that in the textual transmission certain things about the heretics were remembered with a tenacity greater than that with which their names were remembered. That is, P, M and C2 all agree that the

king's disparaging remark follows the prevaricator but they disagree completely on what the prevaricator's name was. These findings will later prove useful.

The following list gives the doctrines found in our texts, with a letter designation assigned to each one for convenience.[76]

A There is neither merit nor demerit. (from "acting or causing to act" to "there is no merit")

B There is no effective action. (from "there is no cause for the impurity of beings" to "they experience pleasure or pain in the six classes")

CC There is a fixed samsaric process through which all beings must pass before they escape suffering. (from "there are x types of birth" to "shall put an end to suffering")

D There is no giving, etc....there are no enlightened teachers.

E A person consists of the four elements and at their dissolution he perishes.

F There are seven elemental, eternal, immutable substances.

---

[76]Note that while the order in which the doctrines are listed here generally follows P, this is done for convenience only and does not express any theory as to the correct or most ancient order. Note also that the material put into quotation marks in this list (within brackets) is not quoted exactly from any one version but is merely meant informally to define the extent of the passage in question.

In compiling this list I have had an eye to Basham's analysis (Ājīvikas, pp. 22-23) but have not followed him in a detailed way. Cf. also Bapat, "The Śrāmaṇyaphala-Sūtra and Its Different Versions in Buddhist Literature", p. 114.

Each doctrine that occurs separately in any version of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra is listed separately here, with one major exception. C3 divides doctrine A into two parts in a way that is obviously late and artificial. These parts are given in the chart that follows as A1 and A2.

G The four-fold restraint

H The prevaricator

I The omniscient teacher

J One's present condition is the result of past action. Through penance previous karma is eradicated; through refraining from doing new deeds (or producing new karma) one puts an end to suffering.

K One travels saṃsāra alone.

L The three temporal realms are non-existent.

Utilizing the letter designations given above, the following table shows what doctrine is assigned to whom in the various versions of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra.

	C1	C2	C3	M	P
P.K.	A	DE	D[77]	DE	A
M.G.	D	B[78]	A2	B	BCC
A.K.	E	H	A1	FCC	DE
K.K.	B	CCD[79]	K	H	F
N.J.	I	J[80]	B[81]	J[80]	G
S.V.	H	A[82]	L	A	H

[77]A short form.

[78]A short form, neglecting mention of the six classes.

[79]Contains only the last part of D.

[80]These two versions are by no means identical, but they clearly have a common origin. They begin with the same statement, which is paralleled in Pali texts: Yaṃ kiñcayam purisapuggalo paṭisaṃvedeti sukhaṃ vā dukkhaṃ vā adukkhamasukhaṃ vā sabbaṃ taṃ pubbekatahetu. See, for example, MN II, 214; AN I, 173.

[81]A short form.

[82]A short form.

This table permits us to make a number of observations.

1. The great individuality of C3 is here evident. Doctrines K and L are unique to this text and of the remaining doctrines there is agreement with other versions on ownership in only one case, that of D, which is credited to P.K. in agreement with M and C2.

2. Two significant textual allignments are evident. (a) P and C1 agree in two cases (giving A to P.K. and H to S.V.) and partially agree in a further case (giving E to A.K.--P gives him D as well). (b) M and C2 agree in two cases (giving DE to P.K. and J to N.J.) and partially agree in two further cases (giving B to M.G. and A to S.V.--C2's passages are shorter in both cases).

3. Conclusions regarding the individual heretical teachers are as follows:

P.K. There are two different traditions regarding his doctrine. C1 and P wish him to have A; C2 and M wish him to have DE (with C3 adding some weak support to the latter group).

M.G. There is a strong tradition giving him doctrine B. The tradition is particularly impressive since it crosses the line between the two textual groups, showing P, M and C2 in agreement. We may conclude that this much belonged to the ancient text. Whether or not he should be given CC as well, as P wishes, remains unclear.

A.K. P and C1 wish to give him E. This is the only agreement and it is fairly weak, since P accredits him with D as well, whereas C1 does not.

K.K. There is no agreement whatsoever on his doctrine.

S.V. Two sets of agreement are evident: C1 and P give him H, while C2 and M give him A. This issue is closely connected with the problem of P.K.'s doctrine, since two texts give A to S.V. and two give it to P.K.

N.J. There is one case of agreement: C2 and M give him J.

In order to make sense of this rather confusing situation the first necessity is to determine the correct (that is, ancient) order of presentation of the heretics. It has already been noted that P, C1 and C2 agree entirely in their initial lists of the heretics. This order is: P.K., M.G., A.K., K.K., S.V., N.J. C3 has one minor variation, making A.K. precede M.G. M has a major alternative order: P.K., M.G., S.V., A.K., K.K., N.J.[83] This much of the order seems certain: P.K., M.G.,...N.J. This means that C3's order, which deviates from all other sources, is wrong; undoubtedly C3 should be restored to agree with P, C1 and C2. Beyond this, one has no choice but to say that M is outnumbered by the other witnesses. It is perhaps of special importance that C2, which seems in this section to be quite closely related to M, agrees with the other sources rather than with M on the order of presentation. My conclusion is, therefore, that the ancient order in the initial listing is: P.K., M.G., A.K., K.K., S.V., N.J. As has already been argued, the evidence indicates that in the detailed presentation of the doctrines the ancient text modified its initial order slightly,

---

[83] This order is attested in other Mūlasarvāstivādin texts as well. See Vogel's Six Heretics, pp. 20ff.

reversing the last two doctrines so that the prevaricator moved to the final from the penultimate position. It follows that S.V. is likely to have been the prevaricator. In addition to knowing the ancient order of presentation of the heretics, therefore, we know the people to whom two of the doctrines belonged: B belonged to M.G. and H to S.V. Armed with these facts we may reconsider each text.

C2, it appears, should ascribe H to S.V. instead of to A.K. The simplest plan is to then give the displaced A to the vacated slot opposite A.K. That is:

P.K.	DE		DE		DE
M.G.	B		B		B
A.K.	H	⟶	( )	⟶	A
K.K.	CCD		CCD		CCD
N.J.	J		J		J
S.V.	A		(H,A)		H

M has been judged to have deviated from the ancient order of presentation. Now it may be that M has correctly retained the order of doctrines while simply scrambling the names attached to them. (We have seen above that the names do not seem to have stuck very securely to the correct doctrines in the textual transmission.) The actual order of the doctrines in M is:

DE

B

A

FCC

J

H

If we take the liberty of adding to this what we believe to be the correct order of names, we get:

P.K.	DE
M.G.	B
A.K.	A
K.K.	FCC
N.J.	J
S.V.	H

This is almost identical with the list arrived at for C2 and allows us to give the following as the prototype of C2 and M:

C2-M Prototype

P.K.	DE
M.G.	B
A.K.	A
K.K.	(F) CC[84]
N.J.	J
S.V.	H

If our reasoning is correct thus far, P would seem to have preserved the correct order of doctrines; in addition it is not obviously wrong in any of its ascriptions of doctrines to the heretical teachers.

---

[84] It is obvious that D should not be attached to CC as found in C2: this version itself, like all other versions, attests its place elsewhere.

Its joining of CC to B, however, looks suspect and the doctrine it gives N.J. is unique.

C1 appears to be wrong in two respects. (1) it splits DE into two separate doctrines, D and E. This is not an absurd move,[85] but all other versions of the sutra except the suspect C3 attest their unity. If D and E belong together, which is likely, C1 is left lacking one doctrine. Since F and CC are both missing from this version, it is not far-fetched to suggest that it is FCC, attested as a unit in M and elsewhere,[86] that has been lost. (2) C1 is wrong in giving D to M.G., whom we have decided must be given B. We now have the problem of where the restored DE and the hypothetical FCC ought to be inserted. The possible slots are those opposite A.K. and K.K. If we give DE to A.K. and FCC to K.K. this results in a situation where C1 agrees with P on the location of DE and with the C2-M prototype on the location of FCC. Thus encouraged, we tentatively restore C1 as follows:

---

[85] It could easily be argued that these two parts are separate doctrines, nāstikavāda and ucchedavāda. In addition, the nāstikavāda section (D) occasionally occurs by itself in the Pali Canon (see AN V, 265ff.). While D and E may at some point in time have been separate doctrines, however, it seems to me that the textual history of this section of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra becomes exceedingly complex if we take this separation as part of the ancient text. One would have to hold that one of the doctrines generally attested in this section was not present anciently (because there would be room for only four additional doctrines instead of the usual five). To explain how and when the extra doctrine was added (D and E being presumably conjoined at this point) would be a very intricate task.

[86] See below, p. 162.

P.K.	A		A		A		A		A
M.G.	D		(DE)		(DE, FCC)		B		B
A.K.	E						(DE, FCC)		DE
K.K.	B	→	B	→	B	→		→	FCC
N.J.	I		I		I		I		I
S.V.	H		H		H		H		H

If this is compared with the C2-M prototype it is found that, apart from the disagreement over N.J.'s doctrine, the only difference is that doctrines A and DE are reversed. Which of the two proposed orders has the greater claim to antiquity?

To answer this it is necessary to look at P.K. as he exists outside of the *Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra*. A. L. Basham, using both Buddhist and non-Buddhist sources, has argued quite convincingly that he was an Ājīvaka leader, having some connection with the Ājīvaka leader M.G.[87] We will not here go into the arguments for this position, but it may at least be said that the confusion that exists in the Pali Canon over the doctrine of P.K. is not as serious as might first appear. Where he is given doctrines other than A, they are usually parts of B (M.G.'s doctrine).[88] Doctrines A and B do not conflict, and some confusion between them is natural enough if their propounders belonged to the same philosophical and religious movement. Support for the ascription of doctrines A and B to P.K., as well as direct confirmation of his

---

[87] *Ājīvikas*, pp. 80ff.

[88] See AN III, 383-384; SN III, 69.

status as an Ājīvaka leader, can be found in the āgamas preserved in Chinese.[89]

In any case, a bare acceptance of the connection of P.K. with the Ājīvaka system is sufficient to establish the reconstructed C1 as more convincing than the C2-M prototype with regard to the placing of DE and A. For while A, in denying the worth of moral action and the possibility of producing merit and demerit, may be seen as harmonious with Ājīvaka notions of Fate (niyati), DE flagrantly contradicts Ājīvaka tenets. Continued existence in the samsaric process for immense periods of time was assumed by the Ājīvakas for the operation of niyati: there was no question of being cut off, finished, annihilated, as DE so boldly proclaims.

We may, therefore, judge the restored C1 scheme to be closer to the ancient text than the C2-M prototype, except as regards the doctrine of N.J., which remains to be discussed. P is identical with the restored C1 apart from two things: it disagrees on the doctrine of N.J., and it disagrees on the place of doctrine CC. These two issues must now be discussed.

There is much disagreement in our texts over the doctrine of N.J. Of the four doctrines proposed only one is obviously inappropriate. This is doctrine B, proposed by C3. It has already been determined that this belongs to M.G. Not only would N.J. not have said this (it flies in the face of Jain doctrine), but it is hardly conceivable that

---

[89]T.99: vol. 2, pp. 20c, 359c; T.100: vol. 2, p. 478a.

anyone at all familiar with Jain thought would have pretended that he said it. It is such as absurd ascription that it has no force as caricature. The remaining three doctrines can all be attested elsewhere in the canon of Small Vehicle Buddhism, and each is on at least one other occasion ascribed to N.J.[90] What is equally important, none of them contradicts Jain doctrine. Doctrine J is especially impressive in so far as it seems to represent a genuine attempt on the part of the Buddhists to understand their rivals rather than merely to poke fun at them. I see no way, however, to decide which of these statements has a more ancient place in the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra, and must leave the problem unsolved.

The question of whether CC belongs with doctrine B or with doctrine F is difficult to answer. There is perhaps only one textual passage that directly supports P's ascription of CC to M.G., but it is a very strong witness. It is found in the Jain Bhagavatī Sūtra.[91] In this passage a speech is put into the mouth of "Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta" (the form of M.G.'s name found in the Jain sutras) that is, without question, related to our CC. There are many differences in detail but it is clear that the two have a common source.[92] Jain literature also supports the ascription of B to M.G.[93] (which merely confirms our findings

---

[90]For the doctrine of the omniscient teacher (I), see MN I, 92-93; for the doctrine of the four-fold restraint (G), see SN I, 66; for the doctrine of pubbekatavāda (J), see MN II, 214.

[91]See Ājīvikas, pp. 218-219.

[92]The issue has been studied by Barua and Basham. See especially ibid. There are at least five points of significant similarity between the Jain and Buddhist formulations of the doctrine.

[93]The text in question is the Uvāsaga Dasao. See Ājīvikas, pp. 217-218.

above); hence, the evidence for M.G.'s doctrine being BCC is weighty. Is there equally serious evidence to support the contrary position, namely that (a) B and CC are separate doctrines, and (b) CC belongs with F?

Issues (a) and (b) are distinct and can be discussed separately. There is, certainly, evidence that B and CC are, if not separate doctrines, at least separate passages or statements--that they do not belong in direct juxtaposition as found in P. There are, for example, linguistic reasons for asserting that they come from different sources.[94] Secondly, while doctrines B and CC both occur in Buddhist literature outside the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra, in the Pali Canon and elsewhere, I know of no occasion where they are conjoined as a single doctrine as in P. Thirdly, while both doctrines can be found in non-Buddhist literature, they are again not found conjoined. Where B occurs in the Uvāsaga Dasao there is no hint of CC, and where CC occurs in the Bhagavatī there is no hint of B.[95] In short, the only passage anywhere that joins B and CC as a single statement seems to be the very passage in P under discussion.

As to the combination FCC, there is a greater number of witnesses in support of it than there is in support of BCC. It occurs at least twice in the Pali Canon, B being listed as a separate doctrine in these passages.[96] So far as I am aware, it does not occur as a unit outside of

---

[94]Ibid., pp. 24-25.

[95]Ibid., pp. 217-219.

[96]MN I, 516-518; SN III, 210-212.

Buddhist literature, but the doctrine of the seven elements (F) is associated with Ājīvakism and, in fact, with M.G. himself.[97] From the point of view of these sources, FCC certainly seems as sensible a combination as BCC.

There are, therefore, strong arguments that can be made for both BCC and FCC. If we were to limit our scope to the versions of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra the evidence would favor FCC. There is, to be sure, only one version that directly attests this doctrine (M), just as there is only one that attests BCC (P); yet, there are four texts that witness to B's separateness from other doctrines (M, C1, C2, C3) and only one that witnesses to F's separateness (P).[98] We must conclude that if BCC is the correct (most ancient) combination, the corruption to FCC must have taken place very early in the mainstream of the tradition, so that BCC was quite superceded in succeeding literature.

The best we can do in our reconstruction is as follows:

	Ancient Text
P.K.	A
M.G.	B(CC?)
A.K.	DE
K.K.	F(CC?)
N.J.	(G,I,J?)
S.V.	H

---

[97] See Ājīvikas, pp. 262ff.

[98] It is true, however, that C2 has CC without any indisputable trace of F.

Of all versions, P is the closest to the ancient text, having only two dubious points, on neither of which has it actually been proved wrong. At the other extreme is C3. This text breaks doctrine A into two parts, presumably in a desperate attempt to make up a total of six doctrines, and both parts are given to inappropriate people. Doctrines K and L are not attested by any other version and, what is more remarkable, there is nothing particularly "heretical" about them. Both could easily be Buddhist statements. The remaining two doctrines, B and D, are presented in abbreviated form and given to the wrong people. C3, therefore, takes the prize as the most scrambled version, managing to get every ascription wrong. If one wishes confirmation of the unreliability of C3 in this regard, he need only turn to a passage found elsewhere in this same collection (the Chinese Ekottara) where the six heretics are listed together with their doctrines.[99] The passage in question appears to be no more reliable than C3; what is important here, however, is that it disagrees almost completely with C3 on the individual ascriptions. K and L are not to be found. There is, in fact, only one agreement between the two passages: in both cases M.G. is given a portion of doctrine A. It is not at all clear that this is a significant agreement.

The issues discussed above are not new to Western scholarship. Differing views have been expressed regarding the relative accuracy of the various versions of the Śrāmanyaphala Sūtra on the doctrines of the six heretics. Basham, in History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas (1951), writes:

---

[99]T.125: vol. 2, pp. 727cf.

> It is clear that some of these passages are more reliable than others. That in the Dīgha Nikāya shows a completeness and consistency lacking in the rest, and perhaps represents the original source of the other references. The Tibetan and Chinese versions, which have undergone translation, are most suspect, although it is to be noted that the Chinese versions are of a date probably little later than the final recension of the Pāli canon.[100]

It is not clear what Basham means when he says that the Pali version may "represent" the original source of the other versions. He seems to mean that it quite simply is the original source. This is doubtful. That the Pali version of our sutra stands very close to the "ancient text" will be seen in the present study, but I believe it quite wrong to identify the two. Basham's statement is problematic in additional respects. He says that "the Tibetan and Chinese versions...are most suspect". It will hopefully be evident from the present work that the different sources in these languages have widely differing degrees of historical reliability: it is most unhelpful to make this sort of general statement about them. Furthermore, the reason given for this unreliability is that these texts "have undergone translation." But there are far more important reasons for whatever unreliability may exist, as will become clear in the present study. Basham has of course not escaped criticism for his remarks. Claus Vogel, in his recent The Teachings of the Six Heretics (1970), has the following comment to make:

> The teachings of the six heretics, the disputation and refutation of which threads its way through the greater part of Buddhist literature, are best

---

[100] Ājīvikas, p. 23.

> known to scholars from the Pali Sāmaññaphalasutta. In fact, ever since it was translated for the first time in 1852, the Sāmaññaphalasutta has been considered the most authoritative work on the subject. All other texts, unless simply neglected, are relegated to the plane of secondary evidence, whose worth or unworth comes to be measured by its degree of conformity with the locus classicus. This holds especially good for the Tibetan and Chinese sources, which even in the latest and hitherto closest study of the topic are conveniently dismissed as 'most suspect'. Yet it is the Tibetan and Chinese versions of those doctrines, not their Pali and Prakrit counterparts, that are both superior in number and more consistent in content among themselves.[101]

A few pages later Vogel adds that the doctrines of the heretics as found in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya "make up a uniform whole contrasting favourably with the medley of testimonies of the hitherto dominant Pali school....Hence anybody who wishes to argue that the Tibetan and Chinese sources may be ignored in a study of the six heresies must do so on other grounds than that they 'have undergone translation'".[102] With the spirit of Vogel's remarks one can sympathize. The Tibetan and Chinese sources must indeed be taken seriously. Yet Vogel has, in trying to make his point forcefully, erred in the same way as Basham, namely by treating the non-Pali sources as if they were amenable to general statements. It is simply not true in general that "the Tibetan and Chinese versions of those doctrines" are "more consistent in content

---

[101]P.1. Vogel's footnotes to this paragraph indicate that the first translation of the Sāmaññaphala was by Burnouf, and that the judgement of the non-Pali sources as "most suspect" is Basham's.

[102]P. 4. A footnote indicates that Basham is the source of the criticized comment.

among themselves" than their Pali counterparts. That this is not the case can be seen from the material translated and analysed in the present work. One needs to speak carefully of specific texts and traditions. It may well be true that the Tibetan and Chinese sources belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya are more consistent among themselves than the Pali sources. Even here, however, this does not necessarily mean that they point to a more ancient situation in the text. For example, at the present stage of our knowledge in Buddhist studies an agreement between a Buddhist text and an apparently independent Jain text must be judged of greater historical worth than agreements belonging solely to Buddhist texts, and especially to Buddhist texts of one school. Hence while Basham's acceptance of BCC as the doctrine of M.G. may seem perverse in view of the witnesses for a different arrangement, the Jain sources mentioned above cannot lightly be dismissed.

The above quotations show how unguarded statements in support of the Pali texts have led to a strong reaction among certain scholars, who are anxious to remove the Pali Canon from its "hiterto dominant" position. The question of whether or not the Pali school deserves to dominate studies of the canon of Small Vehicle Buddhism remains prominent, therefore, to the present day.

Before proceeding to the next section one further point may be made. It will be noticed that the king's reaction to the speeches of the heretics, while it varies in details, is everywhere the same in import. He is in each case frustrated by the inappropriateness of the speeches. This is everywhere given expression in the simile of the mango and the breadfruit. The simile is not a common one in

Buddhist literature and it is therefore rather striking in its present occurrence. Undoubtedly it was part of the ancient text, and it informs us in a very clear manner of one of the themes of the text. What is stressed in this sutra is not that the heretics' answers are evil or wrong, but rather that they are unskillful and inappropriate. Having asked about one thing the king has been answered in terms of another thing. We shall return to this theme later.

The Buddha's discourse

After the recounting of the visits to the six heretics the king puts his question to the Buddha. In P, C1 and Tb he repeats his earlier question about the fruits of the *śramaṇa*'s life verbatim; in C2 and C3 the form of the question is different, as we by now expect. It has already been decided that the form attested by the former three witnesses is the most ancient.

In all versions the Buddha replies to the king with a series of questions. The distinction between this mode of teaching and the inflexible sermonizing of the six heretics is therefore preserved in all traditions. C3 is, however, quite distinct in its treatment from this point on, so we shall for the moment leave it aside and restrict our attention to the remaining texts.

Of the several cases that the Buddha puts to the king for his consideration, the first is that of the slave who becomes a *śramaṇa*. The general facts attested here are as follows. The slave reflects on the difference between the king Ajātaśatru and himself: while both

are men they are in social position and happiness far apart. The slave at once remarks that this demonstrates the great power of action. It is from meritorious deeds in a previous existence that the king has attained to his present condition. Thinking that he too will win merit, the slave decides to leave home and become a śramaṇa. He shaves off hair and beard, puts on the saffron robes, goes forth and practices the self control proper to a monk. These facts come to the king's attention. When the Buddha has thus set the scene he asks the king what he would do in such a situation (that is, how he would treat this man).

The details of the case as given up to this point may now be considered. In P the slave is described as one who "rises up in the morning before you do and retires later to rest, who is keen to carry out your pleasure, anxious to make himself agreeable in what he does and says."[103] This material is formulaic, being found in other contexts in the early canon, both in the Pali tradition and elsewhere.[104] Since its presence in this context is not clearly attested by any other version, it must be suspected of being a Pali addition.[105] No two versions are,

---

[103] Rhys Davids' translation, Dialogues, I, p. 76. The Pali is: pubbuṭṭhāyī pacchānipātī kiṅkārapaṭissāvī manāpacārī piyavādī. DN I, 60. Some of these terms are subject to slightly different interpretations from those given them by Rhys Davids.

[104] See, for example, the passage in the Mahāsudassana Sutta (DN II, 176) where the description is used of the king's "woman treasure" (and cf. T.1: vol. 1, p. 22b, 14-15 for the parallel reference in the Chinese Dīrgha). See also MN II, 84f.

[105] It is possible that Tb's raṅ-dbaṅ med-pa may correspond to P's kiṅkārapaṭissavī, but this is not certain. See the following note.

in fact, the same in their descriptions of the slave, and no textual allignments are visible.[106] After the introduction of the slave a distinction can be seen between those texts that have him simply reflect to himself on the exalted position of the king and those that have him actually observe the king. P and C2 are in the former category, C1 and M in the latter.[107] C1 and M present the king disporting himself in his palace as described in the beginning of the sutra in these versions, and being observed by his slave while thus engaged. The present passage is thus in these texts nicely tied in with the initial setting of the sutra. Effective as it is from the literary point of view, this must nonetheless be judged not part of the ancient text, in light of the analysis made earlier of the "Beginning of the Narrative" section. However, the interesting statement that the king and the slave are both men must have been present in the ancient text, being attested by P, M and C2.[108]

---

[106]Tb reads as follows: "Great King, suppose you have a servant, a slave, an attendant, a man without liberty, a man without joy" (dper-na 'di-na khyod-kyi bran mṅag-gzug-pa go-re-loṅ raṅ-dbaṅ med-pa dga'-mgur-byar med-pa źig yod-pa). Peking Kanjur, vol. Ce, fol. 245a, 1 (Otani Reprint, vol. 42, p. 126). It is true that the first three terms used for the slave here are close to P's puriso, dāso, kammakāro.

[107]Tb reads: "He sees you sitting on the top storey of your palace, giving way to and possessing the five sense pleasures, diverting and delighting yourself with divine music, indulging in sense desire" (des khyod steṅ-gi khaṅ-bzaṅs-kyi gźi-la 'dug-ste 'dod-pai yon-tan lṅa 'byor ciṅ ldan-par gyur-nas skyes-pa med-par rol-mos rtse-bar byed dga'-bar byed dga'-mgur spyod-par byed-pa mthoṅ-ṅo) Peking Kanjur, vol. Ce, fol. 245a, 1-2 (Otani Reprint, vol. 42, p. 126). The details of this are not clear in Rockhill's translation.

[108]P: ayaṃ hi rājā Māgadho Ajātasattu Vedehiputto manusso, ahaṃ pi manusso (DN I, 60). C2: 阿闍世王是人我亦是人. (T.22: vol. 1, p. 272b, 16-17). Tb: lus-'phags-mai-bu ma-ga-dhai rgyal-po ma-skyes-dgra 'di yaṅ mi yin-la bdag kyaṅ mi yin-las. Peking Kanjur, vol. Ce, fol. 245a, 2 (Otani Reprint, vol. 42, p. 126) 104.

The slave then makes his exclamation about the effects of merit.[109] The desire to gain merit is obviously the slave's motive for leaving home to become a śramaṇa in every version. That one leaves home out of faith is a common idea in the early canon, but faith is mentioned in the present passage only in M and C2. This was likely not part of the ancient text. In all versions the outward symbols of the going-forth--shaving off hair and beard and putting on the saffron robes--are specified.

In describing the man's spiritual attainments C1 is the most concise, contenting itself with saying that the monk "practices religion and carries out the Impartial Law," whatever this means.[110] The other versions have two additional sections. First, some specific attainments of the śramaṇa are detailed; second, a third party is introduced to report the facts about the śramaṇa to the king.

P lists the following attainments: the monk remains "restrained in act and word and thought, content with mere food and shelter, delighting in solitude."[111] In C2 his attainments are: he takes on the precepts,

---

[109] P: Acchāriyaṃ, vata bho, abbutam, vata bho, puññānaṃ gati puññānaṃ vipāko (DN I, 60).

[110] One notes that P has "so evaṃ pabbajito samāno" ("He being thus gone forth"), DN I, 60. The Pali word samāna, besides being as here a present participle from the root as = "to be", can correspond to Skt. samāna = "similar, equal, even". The latter would probably be rendered in Chinese as 平等. Could this Pali (or Prakrit) word have been misunderstood in the C1 tradition, giving rise to this reference to "Impartial Law" (平等法)?

[111] Rhys Davids' translation, Dialogues, I, p. 77. The Pali is: kāyena saṃvuto vihareyya, vācāya saṃvuto vihareyya, manasā saṃvuto vihareyya, ghāsacchādanaparamatāya santuṭṭho, abhirato paviveke. DN I, 60.

carries out the religious prohibitions, and refrains from ten bad practices, which are detailed. He is later said to guard body, mouth and thought, refrain from the myriad evils and carry out the "ten goods" (十善).[112] The phrase "guarding body, mouth and thought" is the only one that directly corresponds with P. Tb has as his attainments simply this, that for as long as he lives he abstains from the ten bad practices, which are listed. The ten bad practices is question are the daśa akuśalāni karmapathāni (or daśa akuśalāni), the corresponding good practices being the daśa kuśalāni karmapathāni (or daśa kuśalāni, obviously the "ten goods" of C2). These are known to the Pali Canon[113] but are not found in P in the present context. It is striking that M and C2 agree in giving them at length here in distinction from the other versions.[114] This ties M and C2 together in a way that recalls their agreement in the Six Heretics section.

---

[112] T.22: vol. 1, p. 272b, 24.

[113] See, for example, AN V, 250ff.

[114] The C2 and Tb lists are given below. T.22: vol. 1, p. 272b, 20-21; Peking Kanjur, vol. Ce, fol. 245a, 5-6 (Otani Reprint, vol. 42, p. 126). The Pali terms are from AN V, 250ff., and an English translation is appended.

English	Pali	C2	Tb
taking life	pāṇātipāta	殺	srog-bcod-pa
stealing	adinnādāna	盜	ma byin-par len-pa
sensuality	kāmesu micchācāra	婬	mi ts'aṅs-par spyod-pa
lying	musāvāda	妄言	rdzun-nu smra-ba
slander	pisuṇā	兩舌	phra-ma
rough speech	pharusā	惡口	ts'ig rtsub-po
idle talk	samphappalāpa	罵詈	ts'ig kyal-ba
covetousness	abhijjhā	嫉	brnab sems
ill-will	byāpāda	怒	gnod sems
wrong-headedness	micchādiṭṭhi	癡	log-par lta-ba

The rift between M and C2 on the one hand and P on the other hand is not, however, as great as might first appear. The daśa akuśalāni divide into three groups: the first three items apply to the body, the next four to speech, and the last three to thought. This division is made quite explicitly in texts that deal with the list.[115] It has already been noted that C2 agrees with P that the monk "guards body, speech and thought." It is very likely that the list of the ten bad practices is an expansion of the earlier and briefer three-fold scheme. In this case C2 functions as an intermediary, having reference to both the three-fold group (found in P) and the ten-fold group (found in Tb), and illustrating the tendency towards expansion of the text. This relationship among the three texts is reminiscent of that noted in the "Beginning of the Narrative" section.

This does not mean, however, that everything found at this point in P is ancient. The phrase "content simply with food and covering" (ghāsacchādanaparamatāya santuṭṭho), for example, is not peculiar to this context, being found elsewhere in the early canon.[116] Since its presence in the passage under discussion is not attested by any other version it is likely that it is an addition peculiar to the Pali tradition.

---

[115] AN V, 266 has: "Of three kinds, Cunda, are impure deeds done by the body; of four kinds those done by speech; of three kinds those done by mind" (tividhaṃ kho Cunda kāyena asoceyyaṃ hoti; catubbidhaṃ vācāya asoceyyaṃ hoti; tividhaṃ manasā asoceyyaṃ hoti). Reference here is to the akuśalāni karmapathāni, which are detailed in this context.

[116] See MN I, 360 and cf. the Chinese Madhyama parallel at T.26: vol. 1, p. 773a, 26.

The ancient version probably had only a brief reference to the monk's three-fold restraint. None of the other details found in the various versions can claim antiquity.

The intermediaries who describe the monk and his attainments to the king were probably found in the ancient text. Only C1 excludes them. Further details as well as textual allignments are difficult to sort out.

The Buddha then asks the king if he would treat the monk as if he were still a slave. In the king's reply C1 is by far the simplest. "Not so, World Honoured One," says the king, "If I saw them coming I would rise, welcome them, and beg them be seated."[117] This corresponds closely with the first part of P's passage: "Nay, Lord, rather should we greet him with reverence, and rise up from our seat out of deference towards him, and press him to be seated."[118] But in P the king goes on to offer the śramaṇa (1) the requisites of a monk (robes, food, etc.) and (2) his royal protection. C2 and Tb are here quite close to one another. Neither makes mention of the offering of a seat to the śramaṇa but both insist on the honour and respect the king pays him. After this respect is mentioned these versions have the king offer the śramaṇa the various requisites, which are essentially the same as in P. Neither of these texts mentions the king's offering of protection.

---

[117]The plural seems implied in C1.

[118]Rhys Davids' translation, Dialogues, I, p. 77. The Pali is: Nohetaṃ bhante, atha kho naṃ mayameva abhivādeyyāma pi, paccuttheyyāma pi, āsanena pi nimanteyyāma. DN I, 61.

The simplest explanation, as so often is the case, is that the shortest version is the oldest. If this is so, C1 represents the earliest stage, where the king offers his respect; C2 and M represent the next stage, where he offers in addition material sustenance; in the most developed stage, seen in P, he adds to this royal protection. Whatever the solution may be, there is no reason to feel that P's three-fold scheme (attested in the same form elsewhere in the Pali Canon)[119] was part of the ancient text.

Next follows a short exchange between the king and the Buddha relative to the fruits of the śramaṇa's life. C2 lacks it, but since it is present in the remaining texts one must conclude that C2 has dropped it. P has a five part dialogue as follows:

1. Buddha: "What do you think, Great King, such being the case is there visible fruit of the śramaṇa's life or not?"

2. King: "Truly, Sir, such being the case there is visible fruit of the śramaṇa's life."

3. Buddha: "This, Great King, is the first visible fruit of the śramaṇa's life pertaining to this very existence, shown by me."

4. King: "Are you able, Sir, to show another visible fruit of the śramaṇa's life pertaining to this very existence?"

5. Buddha: "I am able, Great King. Hence I shall now put a question to you."[120]

---

[119] See, for example, MN II, 89, 101.

[120] DN I, 61.

C1 and Tb contain parts 1 and 2 and in words very close to P, yet in neither is there any sign of 3, 4 and 5. These elements are apparently P's additions to the ancient text. They have a very definite function, namely to add clarity and a sense of progression to the presentation of the fruits of the śramaṇa's life. P continues to develop this scheme in its unique way during the remainder of the sutra.

The Buddha next puts a second case to the king for his consideration. In C2 there is no second case, the Buddha going on directly to describe the situation where a Fully Enlightened One appears in the world. P, C1 and Tb all include the second case, however, so we can assume it was part of the ancient text.

C1 describes the person in question as a man within the king's borders living off the king's largesse. Having thus introduced him this version is content to have the ensuing events identical with those of the first case. The remaining two accounts share little with C1 beyond the basic fact that the second case involves someone more exalted than the slave of the previous case.[121] But they agree closely with one another. P describes the man as a farmer (kassaka), householder (gahapatika), and increaser of wealth (rāsivaḍḍhaka). He is also called kārakāraka, which seems to mean either one who pays taxes or one who performs a religious offering.[122] Tb reads very similarly: khyim-bdag (householder),

---

[121]It is interesting, however, that Tb agrees with C1 in explicitly placing the man within the king's borders. C1: 若王界内 --T.1: vol. 1, p. 109a, 27. Tb: rgyal-po chen-po dper-na khyod-kyi yul 'di-na--Peking Kanjur, vol. Ce, fol. 245b, 7-8 (Otani Reprint, vol. 42, p. 126).

[122]See Rhys Davids' translation, Dialogues, I, p. 77; Sumaṅgala, 170; PTSD s.v. kārakāraka.

źin-pa (farmer), *skrun-pa skyed-pa* (producer of produce--apparently an interpretation of *kārakāraka*), *rgyal-poi ban-mdzod 'phel-bar byed-pa* (augmenter of the king's wealth).[123] It is likely that this description was part of the ancient text. Having introduced the man in very similar terms, however, P and Tb deal with him in keeping with their particular treatments of the slave in the first case. In P he guards body, speech and thought, and so on; in Tb, after leaving home out of faith he shuns the ten bad practices. P is the only version that further distinguishes this man from the slave. It makes mention of the fact that the householder abandons his wealth and relations.[124] This detail, unattested elsewhere, has no claim to antiquity in this section, being evidently taken from the standard formula describing the householder who leaves home out of faith in the Buddha.[125]

The exchange between the Buddha and the king that follows reveals nothing really new, each version conforming to its earlier plan, but we get important confirmation of the distinctiveness of P. Here, when the Buddha has announced that he has just shown a second fruit of the *śramaṇa*'s life, the king asks him if he can show "another visible fruit of the *śramaṇa*'s life pertaining to this very existence, more

---

[123] Peking Kanjur, vol. *Ce*, fol. 245b, 8 (Otani Reprint, vol. 42, p. 126).

[124] So aparena samayena appaṃ vā bhogakkhandhaṃ pahāya mahantaṃ vā bhogakkhandhaṃ pahāya, appaṃ vāñātiparivaṭṭaṃ pahāya mahantaṃ vā ñātiparivaṭṭaṃ pahāya. DN I, 61.

[125] See the passage at DN I, 63.

excellent and more wonderful than these [previous] visible fruits of the śramana's life."[126] The Buddha agrees to do so but says first: "Therefore, Great King, listen and pay attention, for I shall speak."[127] Neither the reference to the "more wonderful" fruits nor this sentence of admonition is attested elsewhere and there is no reason to believe the ancient text had them.[128] Instead, it is apparently a case of the Pali tradition attempting, in general, to give a sense of logical progression to the Buddha's discourse and, more specifically, to draw a distinction between the quality of the fruits discussed thus far and of that which follows. Those presented up to this point have involved people who have gone forth and become śramaṇas, but who have not gone forth into the religious system of a Fully Enlightened One and whose attainments have been modest. The third case, to which the present passage is an introduction, involves the rise of a Buddha in the world, and the person who goes forth under him attains the highest of goals, that of arhatship. Hence this attainment is described not merely as the third fruit, but as that which is "more wonderful" than the previous ones, and the king is exhorted to pay special heed to it.

The basic facts of the third case are as follows. A Buddha arises in the world and a householder, obtaining faith in him, goes

---

[126] Sakkā pana, Bhante, aññaṃ pi diṭṭheva dhamme sandiṭṭhikaṃ sāmaññaphalaṃ paññapetum imehi sandiṭṭhikehi sāmaññaphalehi abhikkantataraṃ ca paṇītataraṃ ca. DN I, 62.

[127] Tena hi, Mahārāja, suṇohi, sādhukaṃ manasi karohi, bhāsissāmi. Ibid.

[128] The admonitory sentence is formulaic. See, for example, DN I, 124.

forth to the homeless state. As in the previous two cases the śramaṇa has certain specific accomplishments. These are given at great length in a section that describes the training of the śramaṇa, from his moral behavior through his meditational and psychic attainments all the way to his destruction of the Outflows and his victory over rebirth.

The entire section of the text under discussion here, from the appearance of a Buddha to the destruction of the āsravas, is a coherent and separate work, which occurs in many other sutras both in the Pali and non-Pali traditions. In the first of the three major divisions of the Pali Dīgha Nikāya (called Sīlakkhandhavagga) this document occurs in the great majority of sutras.[129] It is, however, written out in full only in the Sāmaññaphala Sutta; elsewhere it is abbreviated, apparently with the understanding that in recitation it would be repeated in its entirety. Direct reference is usually made to the Sāmaññaphala Sutta for details. The reader of the Dīgha, therefore, may get the impression that this document "belongs to" the Sāmaññaphala, from which source the other sutras have merely borrowed it. That this is an accurate understanding of the situation is doubtful. The Sāmaññaphala is the first sutra one encounters in the Sīlakkhandhavagga that includes the entire document,[130] and it makes sense that it be given in full here and

---

[129]The Sīlakkhandhavagga, or "Section Containing the Body of Moral Actions," is apparently named from the inclusion of the three-part document dealing with moral actions in every sutra in the collection. This three-part document, however, is itself only one part of the longer work being discussed here. While every sutra in the Sīlakkandhavagga contains the morality-document, not quite all contain the longer document.

[130]The Brahmajāla Sutta contains only the smaller morality-document.

abbreviated in the following sutras. But it has already been seen that it is not at all certain that this particular arrangement of the sutras in the Dīrgha is ancient.[131] In the Chinese Dīrgha one finds the document in question in a number of sutras (by and large the same ones in which it is found in the Pali Dīgha), but here it is given in full only in the A-mo-chou ching (= Pali Ambaṭṭha Sutta). And, predictably, one finds that this is the first sutra encountered in this collection that contains it; the other sutras in which the composition occurs, including the Śrāmaṇyaphala, are placed further on in this Dīrgha and hence have only an abbreviated version.[132] All of this suggests that it has no unique relationship to the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra. This is confirmed by a study of the themes and contents of the relevant sutras: the document in question fits well in our sutra, but it fits equally well in many of the other sutras in which it is found.

It may seem peculiar to ignore this document in the present work. It seems to be very ancient, and it is a mine of information on the religious and secular practices of its day. But it is its very richness, complexity and length, coupled with the fact that it is not uniquely related to our sutra, that put it outside of this thesis. Hopefully, it will eventually receive the attention it deserves from scholars in the field of Buddhist studies.

---

[131] See above, pp. 110-111.

[132] The Chinese Dīrgha does not have a Sīlakkhandhavagga, and the sutras that contain our document are scattered throughout the collection.

For our present purposes the main point to be made is that the ancient text must have included this document. It is incorporated smoothly into P.[133] It is retained in full in M (as witnessed by Tb and S) even though it is hardly relevant to the Devadatta story and in fact seriously disrupts it. It is included whole in C2. C1's abbreviation of it is not a serious problem, as should be clear from the preceding discussion. Its omission by C3 will be dealt with below.

The case of the Buddha's discourse in C3, which was initially postponed because of the idiosyncratic treatment of the section in this version, may now be dealt with. Here the question being answered is: "If one in this present existence makes merit does he here and now receive recompense?" The Buddha proceeds to demonstrate that one may in fact win recompense in one's lifetime. He uses the example of people in the king's service who through their meritorious deeds win recognition and promotion. These people successively win high position and material happiness and then, entering another area of attainment, obtain the opportunity to go forth from the household life and become monks. The section is then divided into several parts, where the attainments of the monk are listed and the king's respect on account of

---

[133] P's incorporation of the document is perfected by the Buddha's remark at the completion of the long document after the destruction of rebirth has been described: "This, O king, is an immediate fruit of the life of a recluse, visible in this world, and higher and sweeter than the last. And there is no fruit of the life of a recluse, visible in this world, that is higher and sweeter than this." (Rhys Davids' translation, Dialogues, I, p. 94) The Pali is: Idaṃ kho, Mahārāja, sandiṭṭhikaṃ sāmaññaphalaṃ purimehi sandiṭṭhikehi sāmaññaphalehi abhikkantataraṃ ca paṇītataraṃ ca. Imasmā ca pana, Mahārāja, sandiṭṭhikā sāmaññaphalā aññaṃ sandiṭṭhikaṃ sāmaññaphalaṃ uttaritaraṃ vā paṇītataraṃ vā natthi. DN I, 85. This statement occurs in no other version and was likely not part of the ancient text.

them stressed. Finally, the case is put where the monk attains parinirvāṇa at life's end, whereupon the king exclaims that he would honour the body of this person as he would honour a god. After each demonstration the Buddha says: "By this expedient you may know that one who in the present existence makes merit receives present and visible recomplense."

C3 does, of course, share some features with the other versions. The case of a person in the king's service is customarily discussed first in the various texts; the going forth from home as found in C3 is typical in most respects; the description of the monk in his various attainments is, as far as it goes, what we would expect. C3's treatment of the section is, nevertheless, quite unique in several respects. For example, in all other versions, inasmuch as it is the fruit of the śramaṇa's life that is at issue, there is no mention of recompense being gained while one is still at home. In C3 one receives various types of fruit while still in the household life. Here the point being made is that one can win these rewards in the present existence. More important still is the merit-reward structure fundamental to the entire passage. In each case the person performing the action wins merit and the king is the agent of his reward. When in the household life one does meritorious deeds, one attains status and riches from the king; when in the homeless life one follows a meritorious course of action, one gains the king's honour and respect. It is not too much to say that the attainments of the monk--control of the body, destruction of passion and finally Nirvana--are rather incidental in this version: one's reward is not found in these things

but in the honour one thereby attains, which at its highest point is that due a god.

C3's omission of practically the whole of the long document attested in this section by the other versions is likely a result of the following circumstances. First, from what has already been said it is evident that this document is to some extent independent of the sutra. C3's clean omission of it is not such a large step from C1's abbreviation of it. Second, C3 is already very long compared with the majority of sutras in the Chinese Ekottara, and if it included the work in question it would seem quite out of place in the collection. This simply means that there would have been, perhaps, a certain pressure to shorten where possible: the omission of this work, not really integral to the sutra, would naturally result. Third, this detailed catalogue of moral and psychic accomplishments is in other versions meant to show the many fruits the śramaṇa has won, but in C3 the fruit at issue is the king's response to these accomplishments. Hence one can severely abbreviate them without damaging the main theme.

Outcome and conclusion

This section can be broken into several parts. The different versions are in agreement neither on the number of parts nor on their arrangement. The following list gives the major elements found with an indication of which texts attest them.[134]

[134] C3 is largely excluded from the comparison since it differs widely from the other versions. Occasionally, however, reference will be made to it.

(1) Ajātaśatru responds to the Buddha's discourse with a praise formula (P, C2?).

(2) Ajātaśatru confesses his crime of patricide and begs the Buddha to accept his confession. The Buddha does so (P, C1, C2, Tb, S).

(3) Ajātaśatru takes refuge and becomes a Buddhist lay supporter (P, C1, C2).

(4) Ajātaśatru invites the Buddha and his assembly to share a meal with him and the Buddha accepts. The king then honours the Buddha and leaves (C1, C2, Tb, S).

(5) Ajātaśatru says he must leave because he has much to do (P).

(6) The Buddha addresses the monks after Ajātaśatru's departure, commenting on his spiritual state (P, C1, C2, Tb, S).

(7) Ajātaśatru commends Jīvaka (C1, C2).

(8) Ajātaśatru prepares the meal and the Buddha, together with his assembly, comes at the proper time and partakes of it (C1, C2, Tb, S). Within this section there are several variations. In C1 the repentance and taking of refuge are repeated. In C2 the king invites the Buddha to pass the summer in Rājagṛha but the Buddha declines. In C2, Tb and S the Buddha expresses his thanks for the meal with a standard verse.

Elements (2) and (6) are common to all versions. (Note that C3 also attests them.) There is no question but that they belonged to the ancient text. Element (2) causes few problems. The texts are in general agreement over the form of the confession and the Buddha's response. Passage (6), however, raises interesting questions. In some versions (P, Tb, S) the stress is on the poor spiritual state of

the king: he has gravely injured himself through his act of patricide and has consequently not attained the spiritual fruit from the Buddha's discourse than he otherwise would have. In other texts (C1, C2) the stress is on the great benefits he has gained through his meeting with the Buddha; less stress is put here on the negative effects of his evil action.[135] This difference is important. At stake are the issues of the power of evil action, the power of confession, and the power of the Buddha. A brief consideration of this passage is sufficient to determine the ancient situation.

There is little question but that the dharmacakṣu (dharma-eye) was involved at this point in the ancient text.[136] It is mentioned by P, C1 and C2. M speaks instead of the Four Noble Truths, but this seems to represent an alteration or interpretation of the earlier reference to the dharmacakṣu.

Apart from this divergence P and M are very close in this passage and they allow us to see the ancient text quite clearly. There is no doubt that they, in stressing the poor moral state of the king, are more ancient than the texts that stress the benefits the king has received. First, while P and M agree closely in the terms whereby

---

[135] C3 stands midway between the two groups: it acknowledges that the king would have obtained great benefit had he not killed his father, but it affirms that he has nonetheless gained great advantage.

[136] P reads: "If, brethren, the king had not put his father to death, that righteous man, and righteous king, then would the clear and spotless eye for the truth have arisen in him, even as he sat there." (Rhys Davids' translation, Dialogues, I, p. 95.) (Sacāyaṃ, bhikkhave, rājā pitaraṃ dhammikaṃ dhammarājānaṃ jīvitā na voropessatha, imasmiṃ yeva āsane virajaṃ vītamalaṃ dhammacakkhuṃ uppajjissatha, DN I, 86.)

this poor moral state is described,[137] C1 and C2 are far apart in describing his moral progress. Second, C1 is generally close to P and where it differs it may easily be seen as involving a corruption or interpretation of a reading similar to that found in P. C1 has: "As to this king Ajātaśatru, his transgression is diminished; he has removed a weighty offence."[138] This may seem impossible as an interpretation of the words found in P (khatāyaṃ bhikkhave rājā; upahatāyaṃ bhikkhave rājā),[139] but it is useful to note Rhys Davids' translation of P: "This king, brethren, was deeply affected, he was touched in heart."[140] Presumably Rhys Davids found it difficult to believe that the sutra would end with the statement that the Buddha's discourse had been unsuccessful, and hence he searched for meanings for the terms khata and upahata that would allow things to turn out happily. It is very likely that a similar attitude on the part of the transmitters of C1 resulted in the reading found in that text. Third, there is a very clear rationale for the change in the text seen in C1 and C2, namely, divinization of the Buddha. The C1 and C2 traditions have no doubts about the power of the Buddha to purify the most polluted being

---

[137] P: Khatāyaṃ, bhikkhave, rājā; upahatāyaṃ, bhikkhave, rājā. (DN I, 86). S: Kṣato bhikṣavo rājā Māgadho'jātaśatrur Vaidehīputraḥ, upahato (Dutt, ed., Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part IV, pp. 223-224). Tb agrees completely with S.

[138] 此阿闍世王過罪損減已拔重咎. T1: Vol. 1, p. 109b, 27.

[139] DN I, 86.

[140] Dialogues, I, 95. Cf. also R. O. Franke, trans., Dīghanikāya, p. 85.

and to save the most unsalvageable criminal. One way or another the sutra must end happily, with the king rescued and the Buddha's power demonstrated.

In addition to elements (2) and (6) there is strong support for element (3), the taking refuge. Only M lacks it. It is peculiar that it should be missing here. It is a formal act whereby the king acknowledges his support of the Buddha and goes over to his party: it would seem desirable that this be preserved, for it marks the downfall of Devadatta and is hence of some importance to this narrative. I can offer no explanation for the omission, but in any case the event must be judged to have been part of the ancient text. Possibly the problem would be solved by a thorough study of the appropriate materials in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya.

Element (1), the praise of the Buddha's discourse by means of a common formula, was probably not part of the ancient text. In the Pali Canon this formula is frequently inserted after a discourse of the Buddha, but it is not so widely used by other traditions. In the present context it is completely lacking in all other versions except C2, which may, in a very muddled way, attest parts of it.

Elements (4) and (5) offer alternative conclusions to the meeting. Through its use of (5) P has the sutra end quickly and rather abruptly. The remaining versions (except C3) have the invitation to the meal, which leads to the inclusion of a further episode in the text, element (8). Both (4) and (5) are found elsewhere as devices for concluding sutras[141] and neither is especially helpful to the themes

---

[141]In the Pali Canon, see the three sutras following the Sāmaññaphala for the ending with the meal episode; for the shorter conclusion see the Dhammacetiya Sutta, MN II, 124.

and purposes of this particular work. The main fact in support of the antiquity of the (4), (8) structure is of course the large number of texts that have it. On the other hand, P's (5) is shorter and simpler. In addition, an examination of one of the passages quoted earlier from the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya seems to me to lend support to P's version.

> Meanwhile, Upananda, being utterly exhausted from listening so long, retired to his room to rest. Later in the night he arose, put clogs on his feet, and returned. He made such a great clatter that the elephants and horses, hearing it, were startled and cried out. When the king heard them he was frightened and returned at once to the city.[142]

Surely it is fair to say that this suggests an abrupt ending to the sutra such as is found in P.

In the end it may be wise to reserve judgement on the relative antiquity of these endings. If P's passage is older, the alternative and longer ending must have been introduced at a very early date into the textual tradition. Otherwise one cannot account for its occurrence in so many different versions of the sutra.

Element (7), the commendation of Jīvaka, cannot be admitted as part of the ancient text since it lacks the support of both P and M.

The stages of development of section (8) may have been as follows. The original version was as found in M except that it lacked the verse of thanks. This verse was added at a later stage by the prototype of C2 and M, C2 later going on to add the king's invitation to the Buddha to spend the retreat in Rājagṛha. For its part, C1 expanded

---

[142] See above, p. 117.

the original version of the episode by simply repeating the confession and refuge formulae.

Closing formula

The closing formulae are what we expect. Each version ends with a short and simple passage asserting that those hearing the discourse were well pleased with it. C2 adds gods and asuras to the audience but this is neither unusual nor particularly significant. No textual affiliations are evident here.

Textual Affiliations

The affiliations of our texts are not obvious. But a careful consideration of the similarities and differences found throughout the versions of the sutra suggests that the results arrived at for the section entitled "The Visits to the Six Heretics" are representative of the general situation. The state of affairs may therefore be summarized as follows.

1. C3 is a highly distinctive production. Although in the "Beginning of the Narrative" section it appears closely related to C1, this affiliation is not seen elsewhere in the sutra. Indeed, the impression one gets from this particular section, namely that C3 stands at the end of a line of development in which the other versions are ranged, is not generally confirmed. C3 is in some ways very "developed" but not usually in a way that obviously depends upon the

other texts. C3 and C2 agree on the time of the sutra's events but this exhausts their significant agreement. It is possible that these sporatic cases of agreement owe their existence to borrowing rather than to genuine affiliation.

2. P stands out as the most archaic of our texts. The versions that most frequently agree with P are C1 and M.

The close connection between P and C1 is most clearly seen in the section dealing with the six heretics. Here, C1 was judged the closest to P of all versions; at the same time it was felt to be less accurate (ancient) than P in most details.[143] This confirms the impression one gets from reading the Dīgha Nikāya and the Chinese Dīrgha side by side. These collections are generally quite close; major disagreements are rare. Where discrepancies do occur the Dīrgha is more often wrong (late), showing expansion and corruption of the text. This situation is exemplified in numerous places in our sutra. In the "Beginning of the Narrative" and the "Outcome and Conclusion" sections, C1 is considerably longer than P, and in both cases the longer version is probably later. In the "Meeting of the King and the Buddha" section C1's material can be explained as involving a lengthening of the briefer incidents found in P, with exaltation of the Buddha as the chief rationale for change. Lastly, one may refer to the passage dealing with the moral state of the king after listening to the Buddha's

---

[143]We have not considered the Six Heretics section in detail, of course, but a close inspection of the wording of the doctrines confirms the close connection between P and C1.

discourse: C1 is close to P but shows a change (or corruption) of the text tending in the direction of increased exaltation of the Buddha.

As to P and M, we of course know the sects to which these texts belong and hence have a reasonably good idea of the textual affiliation. We can use this as a standard with which to compare the other affiliations. Although C1 may be the closest to P of all versions, M comes a close second. M is, in comparison with C2 and C3, rather a conservative text containing few corruptions.

3. C1, as just stated, is frequently close to P. In its expansions of early material, however, it sometimes shows agreement with other traditions. In the "Beginning of the Narrative" and the "Outcome and Conclusion" sections it is much closer to the non-P versions than it is to P. Also noteworthy are its closeness to C3 in the early part of the text, which is difficult to interpret, and occasional agreements with C2. In the latter category the most striking cases are the removing of the five royal insignia by the king and the king's commendation of Jīvaka: both events occur only in these two texts. In most places in the sutra, however, these versions are not close. In the Six Heretics section, for example, they disagree completely on the ownership of the doctrines.

4. C2's occasional agreements with C3, P and C1 have already been noted. By far the strongest affiliation demonstrated by this text, however, is with M. These two appear close in the "Beginning of the Narrative"; they show strong connections in the six heretics section, such that we were able to posit a distinct prototype for them; they are close in the "Outcome and Conclusion", each having not merely the

meal episode but also the Buddha's verse of thanks. In addition there are numerous cases of special agreement between these texts on various minor matters. Yet in many of the cases where C2 and M uniquely agree, the readings to which they witness have in our analysis been judged not part of the ancient text. It would therefore seem that they share an ancestor which is itself a descendant of the ancient text. In addition it is clear from the wide disagreements of C2 and M in certain matters, and particularly in the actual wording of passages, that a considerable period of time must have elapsed since the split between the traditions represented by C2 and M.

5. M's affiliations have already been discussed. It is worth noting that while Tb and S are almost identical (there being only one or two cases where Tb has a slight expansion of material found in S), there are significant discrepancies between Tb and C4. These are not all to be explained by the freedom of the Chinese translation as compared with the Tibetan, for there are cases where C4 shows definite relationships with other versions that are lacking in Tb.[144]

Sectarian Affiliations

1. It is difficult to know what to do with C3. There are some features that could be interpreted as primitive and that could be cited to support the Mahāsāṅghika ascription favored by some scholars.

---

[144] Examples are the king's praise of the moonlit night, C4's omission of the reference to the Vṛjjis found in Tb, and the place of the lake simile used to describe the assembly of monks.

C3 omits the long document which in other versions constitutes the third case put by the Buddha; it also omits the meal episode from the last major section of the sutra. The omission of the long document in question does not strike me as a convincingly early feature, however, and a possible explanation for it has already been suggested.[145] The second instance of omission may be more serious. It may indeed be that the lack of the meal episode is an ancient feature, and it is noteworthy that the Mahāsāṅghika version, as witnessed in the Vinaya of that school, seems not have had it.[146] On the other hand, C3's version of the "Beginning of the Narrative" is very developed and appears to owe its form to an elaboration of earlier versions, including those of the Theravāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda. This would be out of the question if C3 were a Mahāsāṅghika work, unless substantial borrowing is admitted as a possibility.

Perhaps the gravest problem with the Mahāsāṅghika theory is that C3 does not fit well on the whole with the picture presented by the extant Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya. The latter attests the existence in this school of a text known as the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra. Yet C3 does not have this title and, what is more important, does not have this theme. If C3 is a Mahāsāṅghika work, therefore, it must belong to a different sub-sect from that to which the extant Vinaya belongs. All things considered, the evidence for this text belonging to the Mahāsāṅghikas is weak.

---

[145]See above, p. 183.

[146]See above, p. 188.

There is, however, no simple alternate theory that can be offered. Any proposal made must make room for considerable omission, as well as borrowing from other textual traditions. Instead of suggesting a complicated and arbitrary theory of affiliation I prefer to leave the sect of this work indeterminate.

2. The close relationship of C2 to M leads to the suggestion that the former is a Sarvāstivādin work. I would not presume to say what particular place within the Sarvāstivādin tradition its sect would occupy. The main facts, however, namely that C2 and M have a common parent descended from the ancient text and that considerable time has nevertheless passed between the existence of this parent and of C2 and M, fit well with the Sarvāstivāda theory.

3. By and large the theory that the Chinese Dīrgha (and hence C1) is a Dharmaguptaka work fits well with our findings. It would explain the proximity of P and C1 as well as the fact that the latter seems generally less ancient and more developed than the former. It is not necessarily problematic that C1 is occasionally closer to the Sarvāstivādin versions. This could simply mean that the features in question arose in the Sthaviravādin tradition before the breaking away of the Sarvāstivādins, but were not adopted by all segments of the tradition (e.g., were not adopted into the Theravādin canon). More problematic, however, is the case in the "Beginning of the Narrative" section where C1 seems to depend upon and go beyond the form of the passage found in the Mūlasarvāstivādin version, which in turn seems to be an elaboration of what is found in the Sarvāstivādin version C2.

There is no way of explaining this without admitting borrowing if one wants to hold on to the Dharmaguptaka theory.

I doubt, however, if any reasonable solution can be offered to the affiliation problems of our texts without allowing borrowing to have taken place among the various traditions. And while the admission of such open traditions is bound to frustrate many projects of textual reconstruction and historical research in Buddhist studies, there is no reason to feel that various sorts of mutual influence were not at work. Monks of different sects appear to have mingled with one another,[147] and there were certainly monks intimately familiar with works of more than one sect.[148] Hence, whether we like it or not it seems probable that works of one sect were apt to be subject to some degree of influence from works of other sects.

The Ancient Text

It has been determined that P has, of all the versions, preserved the most ancient state of the text. The oldest stage of the textual

---

[147]Lamotte, Histoire, p. 573, remarks:

> Entre membres de sectes différentes, les rapports sont cordiaux et faciles: le bhikṣu en voyage a le droit de séjourner dans les établissements bouddhiques qu'il rencontre en chemin; il est certain d'y être accueilli en hôte et traité selon les règles de la politesse monastique, et nul ne peut s'enquérir de ses opinions particulières. Ce protocole demeura toujours en vigueur, et les pèlerins chinois qui eurent l'occasion de visiter l'Inde, du IV[e] ou VII[e] siècle, rencontrèrent fréquemment dans un même monastère des bhikṣu de sectes différentes vivant apparemment en parfaite harmonie.

[148]Note the case of Buddhayaśas, discussed above, pp. 21-22.

tradition accessible to us may, therefore, conveniently be described by listing those cases where we have reason to believe that P has deviated, by addition or deletion, from an earlier source.

(1) Opening Formula

No changes are evident.

(2) Beginning of the Narrative

There is no reason to believe that P is correct in all details of the dating of the event. We are certain only that the time was given as the full moon poṣadha day of the fifteenth.

Although it is likely that the king said something in praise of the moonlit night there is little support for the existence of the particular udāna found in P.

The formula in praise of the Buddha that P puts into the mouth of Jīvaka was not present.

(3) Journey to the Buddha

The older text may have included a reference to the fact that the Buddha delights in silence.

(4) Meeting of the King and the Buddha

P seems to have preserved the ancient text accurately, although there is no support for the details of the description of the Buddha (seated against the middle pillar, etc.).

(5) The King's Question and the Buddha's Response

This is preserved accurately.

(6) The Visits to the Six Heretics[149]

---

[149] It is important to note that this section has not been studied in detail, and hence there may be numerous points left unconsidered where P deviates from the ancient text.

The brief formal exchange between the king and the Buddha preceding the king's recounting of his visits seems not to have been present anciently.

P's ascription of doctrines to the heretical teachers seems generally accurate. It is dubious on only two points, viz. the ascription of the fourfold restraint doctrine to N.J. and the ascription of the doctrine of purification in saṃsāra to M.G. Even in these two cases P may have preserved the ancient text correctly.

(7) The Buddha's Discourse

The formulaic description of the slave found in P is not likely to have been present in the ancient text.

The king's assurances of protection of the śramaṇa are not ancient.

P's careful distinctions of the fruits of the śramaṇa's life (some being higher and more important than others, etc.) are not ancient.

P's description of the householder in the second case put to the king is accurate but the reference to this man abandoning wealth and relations is not ancient.

There are probably a number of features of the long document describing the monk's attainments that are peculiar to the Pali tradition, but we have not examined this document in the present study.

(8) Outcome and Conclusion

The formula whereby the king praises the Buddha was probably not present at a more ancient stage.

The meal episode may have been present in the older version and have been omitted by P. This is, however, by no means certain.

(9) Closing Formula

This is probably preserved accurately.

III

THEMES AND THEMATIC CHANGE

The aim of this chapter is to explore the meaning of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra text family. Primary attention will be given to an analysis of the ancient text. Since the extant texts are descended from this source, considering it in some depth will permit features common to the text family as a whole to be dealt with systematically and economically. After a given issue has been dealt with as it relates to the ancient text, comments will be made relative to the extant versions, with attention to the changes that have taken place in the meaning of the sutra and the mechanisms whereby they have come about. The chapter will be concluded with a summary and discussion of the main sorts of change seen in the texts.

Literary analysis will be carried out chiefly through the isolation of major themes. During the consideration of the ancient text other literature will be drawn upon where helpful to the elucidation of these themes. Most important in this regard are the commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya, Buddhaghosa's Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, which contains the only surviving commentary on the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra, and other sutras from the canon of Small Vehicle Buddhism that contain relevant materials. And, of course, the various existing versions of the sutra frequently are of help in this regard, acting as further commentaries and revealing what is latent in the ancient text by developing and working through particular issues.

The study is not restricted to themes that are unique to the Śrāmaṇyaphala. For we are interested not merely in how this text contributes to the scriptural and religious traditions to which it belongs, but how it partakes of these traditions--what it shares with other literature of the canon. We are thus able to make progress not merely in the understanding of one sutra, but in the understanding of early Buddhism in general.

The themes of the text are not all apparent to the same degree. A broad distinction is therefore made here between explicit themes and implicit themes, the former being those subjects or topics that are straightforwardly presented to the reader, and the latter being those that are subtly present and need to be drawn forth with special consideration. Two explicit themes are discussed: (1) the fruits of the life of a śramaṇa and (2) the conversion of king Ajātaśatru. "The fruits of the life of a śramaṇa" is dealt with in two parts (called "A" and "B"), which focus in turn on the king's question and the Buddha's answer. The first part introduces the discussion of themes and the second terminates it. Four implicit themes are brought forth: (1) the theme of peace, (2) external and internal mastery, (3) the Buddha's skillful teaching, and (4) action and recompense.

Themes

The Fruits of the Life of a Śramaṇa (A)

It was determined in the previous chapter that the title of the ancient text was "The Fruits of the Life of a Śramaṇa,"[1] and it

would be expected that this title would express a major theme of the work. Yet the relation of this topic to the rest of the sutra is not at first obvious. Forming the subject of the religious discourse that leads to Ajātaśatru's conversion, it is structurally subordinate to the latter theme; yet the question remains as to what the logical connection is, if indeed there is any, between the conversion of the king and the fruits of the life of a *śramaṇa*. What has the king to do with *śramaṇas*? Why should he, in his extremely low spiritual state, be interested in the benefits won by monks? These and other perplexing problems relating to the present theme may be approached by addressing two issues, that of the structural relation of the king's question, in which this topic is expressed, to the rest of the sutra, and that of the relation of the theme to the religious context of ancient Buddhism.

The Buddha's wisdom and enlightenment are conveyed in the early literature in a great many ways, one of the most important of which is that involving the passing of a test. The form of the test varies according to the type of literature in question. In the works that belong to the "folk" *genre*, for example,[2] the Buddha (or, in the case of the *Jātaka*, the Bodhisattva) is the one who solves all puzzles and answers

---

[1]Above, pp. 104-105.

[2]The *Jātaka*, of course, belongs to this category, but so does a substantial amount of strictly canonical material. See SN I (*Sagātha Vagga*), especially the *Devatā*, *Devaputta* and *Yakkha Saṃyuttas*, and the corresponding sutras in the Chinese *Saṃyukta Āgama* (T.99: vol. 2, pp. 1ff.).

all riddles. One can see the traditional figures of the clever hero and the sage being transmuted by Buddhist storytellers into the Supreme Wise Man, whose comprehension is all-embracing. In the long dialogues of the Dīrgha and Madhyama a quite similar testing scheme is found. Although actual riddles are not at issue, we see people setting off to try the mettle of the religious leader with a particularly thorny question--a "test question."

In the Abhayarājakumāra Sutta,[3] for example, Nirgrantha Jñātiputra encourages Prince Abhaya to put a difficult question to the Buddha:

> Come you, Prince, approach the recluse Gotama; having approached, speak thus to the recluse Gotama: 'Now, revered sir, could a Tathāgata utter a speech that is disliked by others, disagreeable to them?'[4]

After showing the Prince how to use this question to the discomfiture of the Buddha, Nirgrantha Jñātiputra concludes:

> Prince, the recluse Gotama, on being asked this double-edged question by you will neither be able to spew out nor swallow down (the puzzle). Just like an iron hook stuck in a man's throat that he can neither spew out nor swallow down, even so, Prince, the recluse Gotama, on being asked this double-edged question by you, will neither be able to spew out nor swallow down (the puzzle).[5]

---

[3] MN I, 392ff. I have used I.B. Horner's translation, Middle, II, 60ff.

[4] Middle, II, 60.

[5] Ibid., p. 61. Imaṃ kho te, Rājakumāra, samaṇo Gotamo ubhatokoṭikaṃ pañhaṃ puṭṭho samāno neva sakkhiti uggilituṃ na sakkhiti ogilituṃ. Seyyathāpi nāma purisassa ayosiṅghaṭakam kaṇṭhe vilaggam, so neva sakkuṇeyya uggilituṃ na sakkuṇeyya ogilituṃ, evameva kho te, Rājakumāra, samaṇo Gotamo imaṃ ubhatokoṭikaṃ pañhaṃ puṭṭho samāno neva sakkhiti uggilituṃ na sakkhiti ogilituṃ ti. MN I, 393.

Needless to say, things do not turn out as planned, and in fact the Buddha not only passes the test but also brings Abhaya to take refuge with him. The following structure is thus revealed, of relevance to both the Abhayarājakumāra Sutta and the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra: the Buddha answers a test question and converts the tester to his party and doctrine.[6] To be sure, there are differences between the two sutras relative to this structure. Ajātaśatru is not portrayed as setting off to refute the Buddha; furthermore, he does not appear to have an argument in mind with which to follow up his question and entangle the Buddha in a dilemma. But it is most important to remember that Ajātaśatru's question is neither spontaneous nor innocent. He has asked it previously of six famous religious teachers, and each of them has earned only his contempt by his reply. The king is obviously aware that the question is not easy to answer. Further, it is easy to see that it is the failure of the heretical teachers to respond satisfactorily that has kept the king from going over to their party, even as it is the Buddha's success that leads the king to take refuge with him. In fact, the contrast between the Buddha's success and the heretics' failure in answering the test question is not unique to our text and may be seen as a further element in the structure. In the Mahāsaccaka Sutta, for example,[7] Saccaka the Jain puts the following question to the Buddha: "But does the good

---

[6]Cf. the Dhammacetiya Sutta, MN II, 122-123 (T.26: vol. 1, p. 796b, 15-22).

[7]MN I, 237ff. I. B. Horner's translation, Middle, I, 291ff.

Gotama allow that he sleeps during the day?"[8] When the Buddha has successfully answered this question, which is aimed at impugning his wisdom and enlightenment, Saccaka says:

> It is wonderful, good Gotama, it is marvellous, good Gotama, that while this was being said so mockingly to the good Gotama, while he was being assailed by accusing ways of speech, his colour was clear and his countenance happy like that of a perfected one, a fully Self-awakened One. I allow that I, good Gotama, took Pūrana Kassapa in hand speech by speech, but he, when taken in hand by me, speech by speech, shelved the question by (asking) another, answered off the point and evinced anger and ill-will and discontent. [The same comment is then made with regard to the other five heretical leaders.][9]

The following scheme is hence evident in our sutra. The king asks a test question of a variety of religious teachers; those who fail to pass the test demonstrate thereby their unworthiness and lack of enlightenment, whereas the Buddha passes the test, demonstrates the validity of his vision, and converts the tester. We have come some distance toward understanding the relation between the king's question and the theme of conversion, as well as the relation between the question and the text as a whole. We have done so by ignoring the content of the question. In this regard it is worth noting that in most of the sutras where a test question occurs there is no distinct relation between the content of the question and the conversion event that frequently accompanies

---

[8] Middle, I, 303. Abhijānati kho pana bhavam Gotamo divā supitā ti. MN I, 249.

[9] Middle, I, 304-305.

it. What is essential is simply that the Buddha answer the question, pass the test. This is not to say that the import of the question and the Buddha's particular response are trivial matters, for they may be of great religious importance. The point is simply that the specific issue at stake in the dialogue and the religious event of conversion need not be related. If one is concentrating on the conversion, the substance of the question will be irrelevant; if one is interested in the substance of the question, the conversion merely provides a setting for the presentation of the issue.

In the ancient text of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra, however, there may be a relation, albeit a subtle one, between the issue raised in the question and the king's spiritual state. Ajātaśatru is greatly concerned with his previous evil deeds and with their effects upon him. He is concerned with moral action and its recompense. It is possible, therefore, that his inquiry about the fruit of the śramaṇa's life should be seen as an indirect way of asking about the fruit of moral action. This possibility will be explored more fully later under the heading of the theme of action and recompense.

The next problem to be addressed is that of the place of the present theme (and here we are interested in the content of the king's question) in the context of ancient India during or soon after the time of the Buddha.

The king lists a number of occupations in his question and speaks of the obvious and visible fruit each man wins through his toil. He wants to know if the śramaṇa wins similar fruit. He implies that he considers the toil and exertion of the śramaṇa to be on essentially

the same level as that of the ordinary secular individual: to be a _śramaṇa_ is to be engaged in an occupation not fundamentally different from other occupations.

Surely one would not have to agree with these assumptions. It is clear from the śramaṇical texts of the period (Buddhist and Jain) that people in this religious movement saw themselves as engaged in toil of a radically different sort from that of ordinary people. The Buddhist ritual of going forth from home, and the adoption of the monk's begging bowl, are unmistakable in their significance: the _śramaṇa_ no longer belongs to the world of everyday activity and does not exert himself in this sphere. His exertion is on a different level and so are the fruits that he wins. Why does the Buddha not simply point this out? Indeed, why did the six heretics not point it out? We begin to see that Ajātaśatru's question may not be as innocent as it first appears.

Ajātaśatru was king and overseer of a region apparently much frequented by _śramaṇas_, and it may be that he was interested in having the status of this sizeable group of people clarified. It may in fact be the case that, like others of his time, he was annoyed at their pretensions. They claimed to be above the level of mundane activity, yet they were not above asking others for food and support. So he presents the Buddha with a dilemma. If, on the one hand, the _śramaṇa_'s work brings him concrete, present and visible results, then his occupation is like those of ordinary folk and his claim to be operating in a higher sphere is unacceptable. Further, one may suppose, he would not in this case be exempt from the duties that kings felt free to impose upon people in secular occupations. If, on the other hand, the _śramaṇa_ does not win

such fruits and is above all concern with the mundane, one may question his right to receive the donations (concrete and visible) of the populace.

Criticism of the śramaṇa's parasitical mode of life is well attested in the literature of this period. We find one śramaṇa group criticizing another for wasting the sustenance of the people;[10] we find lay people making the same accusation.[11] The view was that each man ought to carry out his own honest toil and reap the benefit of it. In order to see how this criticism was made and how the Buddha responded to it, let us consider the Kasibhāradvāja Sutta.[12]

The Buddha approaches the brahman Kasibhāradvāja for alms. The latter, who is engaged in directing the ploughing of his fields, says: "I, samaṇa, plow and sow, and when I have ploughed and sown I

---

[10]See, for example, the Kula Sutta, SN IV, 322ff. (= T.99: vol. 2, p. 230; T.100: vol. 2, pp. 423-424). Note also the repeated references in the Buddhist literature to the bad practices of śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas living on food given in faith by lay people (e.g. DN I, 5, ff.; T.1: vol. 1, pp. 89a, 15ff.). Cf. the similar Jain statements in the Sūtrakṛtāṅga, Jacobi, trans., Jaina Sūtras, Part II, p. 367.

[11]See the Kasibhāradvāja Sutta discussed next. (By "lay people" I refer here to all those not begging for a living. The brahman Kasibhāradvāja earns his living by farming.) Relevant passages are also found in Jain literature, such as the following one from the Sūtrakṛtāṅga (ibid., p. 370):

> A man, on seeing Śramaṇas or Brāhmaṇas (whom he detests) degrades himself by various evil deeds. Either he gives them a slap with the open hand to turn them away, or he abuses them. And when the monk at the proper time calls (at his house on the begging-tour), he does not give him alms (but says): those who become Śramaṇas are the meanest workmen, men unable to support (their family), low-caste men, wretches, idlers!

[12]SN I, 172, 173. Numerous versions of this sutra exist. See T.99: vol. 2, p. 27; T.100: vol. 2, p. 466; T.101: vol. 2, p. 493. It can also be found in the Uragavagga of the Sutta Nipāta.

enjoy [the fruits]. May you too, samaṇa, plow and sow, and when you have plowed and sown may you enjoy [the fruits]!"[13] The point could hardly be made more baldly, and we are interested to see how the Buddha meets the challenge. He replies: "But I too, brāhmaṇa, plow and sow, and when I have plowed and sown I enjoy [the fruits]."[14] Instead of immediately affirming that the śramaṇa operates in a different sphere from that of the ordinary man, therefore, the Buddha is anxious to affirm the parallel--to insist that he too toils, and in a way that everyone can understand. The brahman, of course, does not penetrate his riddle-like pronouncement and complains that he does not see the Buddha's yoke and plough, and the other implements of his trade. The Buddha explains in verse that: "Faith is the seed, austerity the rain; wisdom my yoke and plough",[15] and so on in a detailed set of identifications. He ends by saying: "Thus is this ploughing ploughed, and it yields the fruit of the Deathless. He who has ploughed this ploughing is released from all sufferings."[16] Kasibhāradvāja exclaims: "May the good Gotama

---

[13]Ahaṃ kho, samaṇa, kasāmi ca vapāmi ca, kasitvā ca vapitvā ca bhuñjāmi. Tvaṃ pi, samaṇa, kasassu ca vapassu ca, kasitvā ca vapitvā ca bhuñjassu. SN I, 172. Throughout there is a play on the words from the root bhuj. Normally we would translate the latter in this sort of context as "to eat" ("when I have ploughed and sown I eat"), but this does not let the Buddha's pun come through. He does not merely mean that he eats after he has practiced self-cultivation, but that he enjoys the (spiritual) fruit of this effort.

[14]Ahaṃ pi kho, brāhmaṇa, kasāmi ca vapāmi ca, kasitvā ca vapitvā ca bhuñjāmi. Ibid.

[15]Saddhā bījaṃ tapo vuṭṭhi, paññā me yuganaṅgalaṃ. Ibid.

[16]Evamesā kasī kaṭṭhā, sā hoti amatapphalā; etaṃ kasiṃ kasitvāna, sabbadukkhā pamuccati. Ibid., 173.

eat! For a ploughman indeed is the good Gotama, in that he ploughs the ploughing that yields the fruit of the Deathless."[17]

In this short sutra we see both the attack on the śramaṇa's way of life and the way the Buddha tries to meet it. He insists that the śramaṇa works hard for his living, and is not simply a lazy fellow. And he makes the additional point that the fruit thus won is incorruptible and of supreme value. He thus justifies the śramaṇa's receiving of material support by saying that it is made use of in great exertion leading to the highest possible reward.

The situation in the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra is not identical with that in the Kasibhāradvāja Sutta, but there are important points of similarity. Like the brahman in the latter text, Ajātaśatru puts the śramaṇa on the same level as the ordinary man and asks him to stand up and give account of himself. His emphasis, of course, is not on the exertion of the śramaṇa but on its results. Does his effort win immediate and visible fruit? Now it may be that the king has full confidence in the śramaṇa's ability to win eventual and incorruptible reward and that he is merely curious to know if, in addition, he wins present reward. But it is likely that his question is more serious and his suspicion deeper than this. He is distrustful of rewards that anyone can claim and no one prove: he wants to see for himself if there is any reward whatsoever. Kasibhāradvāja and Ajātaśatru, then, are both interested in the same general problem: the śramaṇa takes people's food and yet

---

[17]Bhuñjatu bhavaṃ Gotamo. Kassako bhavaṃ, yaṃ hi bhavaṃ Gotamo amatapphalaṃ pi kasiṃ kasati. Ibid.

appears to accomplish nothing. But Kasibhāradvāja stresses the *śramaṇa*'s simple lack of effort, whereas Ajātaśatru stresses the inefficacy of the effort. In both cases the implication is that if the *śramana* has no attainments he does not deserve support. While in the *Kasibhāradvāja Sutta* the argument is made that the *śramaṇa* produces immaterial reward through material nourishment,[18] it is clear why this argument cannot be used in reply to Ajātaśatru. The latter unequivocally states that he is not interested in hearing about immaterial reward, and to answer thus would be to confirm his suspicion that the *śramaṇa* is wasting his own time and other people's goods.

There are two other reasons why the Buddha must take the king's question seriously and frame his answer carefully. The first is that the king's stress on the present and visible is typical of the age, and of Buddhism itself. In its scepticism and empiricism, as well as its bent toward materialism, it fits well with the radical approach to religious issues common to the period and particularly characteristic of the *śramana* movement. Although it never accepted materialism, Buddhism belonged to this movement and shared these tendencies. When criticizing the beliefs of the brahmans, the Buddha is quick to point out that their weakness lies in the fact that they are not based on direct vision, but instead upon blind tradition.[19] And the Buddhists are anxious to stress the vision, insight and personal verification of

---

[18]Cf. also MN I, 271ff.

[19]See, for example, the *Tevijja Sutta*, DN I, 237-238 (T.1: vol. 1, pp. 104ff.).

the truth that one attains through following their religious path. Likewise, they are keen to show that this insight can be won in this visible existence (present lifetime, drsta dharma). A standard formula describing the gaining of arhatship includes the words: "In this very visible existence he personally experienced the goal of the holy life and saw it face to face, and having attained it he continued to dwell in it."[20] This stress on the "here and now" is particularly noteworthy in veiw of the common notion of the age that one went forth from home and practiced the religious life primarily for the sake of one's future births. In view of the stance the Buddhists themselves adopted, therefore, it is not surprising that the Buddha should feel it necessary to answer the king's question.

The second reason the Buddha must take the question seriously has to do with the idea of fruit, or results, of action. The early Buddhists were insistent that religious activities be effective, that they work. This has often led Western authors to characterize them as pragmatists.[21] Whatever the worth of this ascription, it is certainly true that the value of concepts and practices was seen to depend on their efficacy.[22] It is because it is religiously ineffective and

---

[20]DN I, 177: Brahmacariyapariyosānam ditṭheva dhamme sayam abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajja vihāsi.

[21]See, for example, Edward Conze's Buddhism: Its Essence and Development (New York: Harper & Row, 1959), p. 16.

[22]See the famous parable of the arrow in the Cūlamālunkhya Sutta, MN I, 426ff. (T.26: vol. 1, pp. 804-805 and elsewhere). "Efficacy," of course, has to be defined in a way acceptable to the Buddhists. See K. N. Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge (London: Allen & Unwin, 1963), pp. 358-359.

fruitless that the Buddha refuses to discuss many of the metaphysical issues of the day.[23] It is because it is religiously fruitless that he rejects extreme asceticism.[24] When the king asks about the fruit of the śramaṇa's life, therefore, he is asking a valid and central question.

All of the above has concerned the ancient text. When we turn to the extant versions we find that the theme has undergone more changes in some than in others. P and C1 do little to change it; most importantly, both of these texts preserve intact Ajātaśatru's question. This means that the question is structurally related to the conversion theme and to the sutra as a whole (through its role as a testing device) but is not in any obvious way related to them substantively. By and large, M also does little to change this theme.[25] It must be noted, however, that both C1 and M subtly change the status of the king's question through their increased exaltation of the Buddha. Both in the Beginning of the Narrative section and in the Meeting of the King and the Buddha, these texts amply convey the majesty of the Buddha and imply that it is clear to the king and to everyone else involved in the story that this is the Teacher who is truly enlightened and to whom one ought to go

---

[23] Cūḷamālunkhya Sutta, ibid.

[24] See, for example, the Araṇavibhaṅga Sutta, MN III, 230ff. (T.26: vol. 1, pp. 701ff.).

[25] In C4 the king's question is changed somewhat, so that it is concerned with whether or not people engaged in ordinary occupations can win the fruit appropriate to the śramaṇa. This may be the outcome of "universalization," since it makes the question relevant to a wider group of people, or it may simply be the result of a textual corruption.

for refuge. These traditions could not conceive of the king going to the Buddha with doubt in his heart, nor of his putting the Buddha to the test. This being so, the king's question is problematic, for it has begun to lose its original structural relation to the rest of the sutra.

C2 and C3 solve the problem by changing the question. These versions more than all others see the king's conversion as a foregone conclusion, and give no hint of a test. They strive for literary unity by seeking to relate the question substantively to its context.

In C2 the question Ajātaśatru asks varies from context to context. The general tendency, however, is for the question to be directly expressive of his own spiritual problems. He comes to each of the teachers out of a burning religious need, overwhelmed with guilt and fear, concerned with his future births. There is no attempt to sound out the teacher with a difficult question. The theme of the fruits of the śramaṇa's life is in the process of being deleted from the text, and this corresponds to the increased attention given to the theme of the king's conversion and the theme of peace. The changes in the form of Ajātaśatru's question are not simply the result of random textual corruption but are instrumental in bringing about shifts in emphasis important to this tradition.

In C3 all possibility of the king testing the Buddha is excluded from the outset. The praise of the Buddha and the king's penitent and respectful attitude, especially as expressed in the gāthās, testify to this. In addition, C3 is the only version that has the king repent as soon as he meets the Buddha; evidently, the sermon he receives is not being

inspected and weighed but accepted with a faithful heart. Furthermore, the question Ajātaśatru asks is no longer concerned with the fruit of the *śramaṇa*'s life. It is a new question, with quite different significance.

The Conversion of King Ajātaśatru

The word "conversion" is used herein in a broad sense to include (1) being won over to a group or party, and (2) undergoing a significant psychological or spiritual change.

The theme of the king's conversion gains in prominence in the developing forms of the text. This seems to be related to two separate phenomena. First, as time went on there was a steady growth of legend connected with popular figures. These figures were drawn from the most part from canonical sources, but the stories as they developed contained much that was not originally canonical. There are a number of reasons for the growth of narrative material, the main one being simply that storytelling was a much loved and time-honoured pastime and a recognized way of expressing and communicating religious truth. As far as the monks and nuns were concerned, they were forbidden to engage in secular story-telling[26] and naturally turned to religious story-telling. In addition, some legends are undoubtedly connected with practices such as pilgrimage, the pilgrim hearing and repeating numerous stories associated with the sacred sites and events of his religion. The result of all of this was a great creative accomplishment, seen particularly in the Vinayas, the collections of *jātaka* stories, and the commentarial

---

[26]There is a common list of low topics that one is supposed to avoid. See, for example, DN I, 7-8 (T.1: vol. 1, pp. 89a, 29f.).

literature. In the present case, the narrative material of greatest relevance is that concerning Bimbisāra, his son Ajātaśatru, and the wicked monk Devadatta. The various traditions differ on the legend, but in all of them Devadatta is Ajātaśatru's _protégé_ and leads the latter into sinful acts, the foremost of which are the murder of Bimbisāra (through incarceration and starvation) and the attempted murder of the Buddha(through paid assassins and a maddened bull elephant). The conversion of Ajātaśatru does not occupy the same place in every version of the story, but in all versions it is an important event and tended to be emphasized in the transmission of the _Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra_, which recorded it. While the conversion of the king of Magadha was an important occurrence for the Buddhists and was of interest even in the oldest phases of the tradition, it became more religiously meaningful within the context of the developed legend and hence came to draw more attention as time went on.

The second factor important to the rise of this theme to greater prominence is that of the "divinization" of the Buddha. Increasing stress is put on the saving event, and the more depraved the person is who is saved, the more the Buddha's divine power is demonstrated. The king's conversion is in the later traditions seen precisely as the act of his salvation, and hence it is the focus of attention. In the fifth century A.D. this religious event was of far more interest than the issue of whether or not there were immediate fruits to the life of a monk.

We may now turn to the ancient text and see how this theme was realized. It is said at the outset that the events in question took

place on the posadha day of the full moon.[27] It has already been argued that posadha day would have been an appropriate time for the king to visit and ask questions of religious leaders.[28] We must add that it was on this day that the monks recited the Prātimokṣa and confessed their misdemeanours. Surely it is appropriate that the king too confess at this time.[29] It has further been shown that several textual traditions place the event at the end of the summer retreat.[30] This would mean that the king's visit was on the day of the pravāraṇā ceremony, which involved the confession of all infractions committed during the summer retreat.[31] For at least some Buddhist sects this corresponded with the last day of the religious year.[32] What time could be more fitting for the king's repentance of sin and his resolution to act morally in the

---

[27]Above, p. 123.

[28]Above, pp. 132-134.

[29]There were special moral duties that laymen could take upon themselves on poṣadha day, and in at least some traditions laymen apparently engaged in confession on this occasion (Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary, II [Dictionary], s.v. upoṣadha). I do not know, however, if the latter custom was known to the transmitters of our text.

[30]Above, p. 122.

[31]C. A. F. Rhys Davids' comments on the Pavāraṇā ceremony (Kindred, I, 242, n. 2) are:

> A meeting held at the end of the rainy season, during which, members having dwelt cheek by jowl for three months, grievances might have made themselves felt. Mutual confession was invited (pavāreti) on this valedictory occasion.

[32]This is true, for example, of C2. See above, p. 121.

future? Finally, the full moon may be recognized as a symbol of clarity and purity, both of which are possessed by the minds of the Buddha and his assembly and are sought by Ajātaśatru. This symbolism is found elsewhere in the early canon.[33] Many of the versions of our text lay stress on the fulness and purity of the moon,[34] and in at least one case the connection between the clarity of the moon and the king's mental state is made explicity. C3 has the king say: "Today is surpassingly clear and bright, but my mind has not been enlightened."[35] In short, the temporal setting of the sutra is most appropriate for the confession and conversion of the king.

It has been decided that in the ancient text the king directly expressed his desire to visit a religious leader on this day.[36] P, which seems to have preserved this section accurately, has him give voice to his wishes as follows: "Kaṃ nu khvajja samaṇaṃ vā brāhmaṇaṃ vā payirupāseyyāma, yaṃ no payirupāsato cittaṃ pasīdeyya?"[37] In order to determine what was the king's frame of mind, and what he hoped to gain

---

[33]See the Pavāraṇā Sutta, SN I, 190f. Vaṅgīsa's verses begin: Ajja pannarase visuddhiya, bhikkhū pañcasatā samāgatā ("Today on the fifteenth [the full-moon day], for purity [splendor, brightness] the five hundred monks are gathered together.")

[34]See, for example, above, pp. 30ff. (C1), pp. 72ff. (C3), pp. 90ff. (C4).

[35]Above, p. 76.

[36]Above, p. 127.

[37]DN I, 47.

by visiting a religious leader, it is necessary to know what is implied by cittaṃ pasīdeyya. In Buddhist texts the term pasāda (Skt. prasāda) and the corresponding verbal form pasīdati (Skt. prasīdati) have a rich variety of meanings. The PTS Dictionary gives for pasīdati: "To become bright...to be purified...pleased; to be clear and calm, to become of peaceful heart (mano or cittaṃ pasīdati); to find one's satisfaction in (loc.), to have faith in." There is no reason to believe that only one of these meanings is assumed in the present passage. The parallel passage in Cl, which appears to reflect a reading similar to P, stresses clarity and enlightenment in the midst of mental confusion: "What śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa could I approach that would be able to enlighten my mind?"[38] On the other hand, it was seen earlier that lay people were expected to attain faith in religious leaders when they heard them preach Dharma on poṣadha day.[39] Lastly, the theme of peace is central to the text, as will be argued later, and there is no question but that the king is here expressing his need and desire for peace. The expression cittaṃ pasīdeyya, therefore, has both an ambiguity and a richness.[40]

---

[38] Above, pp. 31ff.

[39] Above, p. 133. The passage in question says: Te labhanti aññatitthiyesu paribbājakesu pemaṃ, labhanti pasādaṃ. ("They would gain affection for and faith (pasāda) in these ascetics of other sects.") It is not really circular argument to use this passage to support the interpretation of "to have faith in" for pasīdati. Pasāda used with a noun in the locative, as in the passage above, usually has the meaning of "faith in", and this is in any case clear from the context.

[40] Rhys Davids does well with this expression in his translation. He gives the king's question as: "Who is the recluse or Brahman whom we may call upon to-night, who, when we call upon him, shall be able to satisfy our hearts?" Thus he captures some of the richness inherent in the term. When he comes to the recommendations made by the various ministers he translates: "It may well be that, on calling upon him, your heart, Sire, shall find peace" (cittaṃ pasīdeyya). Here he emphasizes the meaning that is the most important, that of peace. Dialogues, I, 66.

The king Ajātaśatru is setting out to attain faith, clarity of mind, and above all, peace.

Although the king has these needs, there is no indication in the ancient text that he is in extraordinary turmoil and distress, and no reason is given at this point for his lack of peace. We learn more about his mental state, however, from the description of his journey to the Buddha. He is shown as distrustful, hesitant, and in constant fear. When he approaches the Buddha he at once remarks on the stillness of the assembly of monks, and it is evident that it is precisely this serenity that he longs for. Nevertheless, although he is impressed and respectful, the ancient text does not give definite signs of his impending conversion, and he is not above asking his test question. This is a crucial point in the encounter between Ajātaśatru and the Buddha, and we are anxious to see how the Buddha is going to respond. He does so by immediately asking in return if the king has ever put this same question to other religious leaders. As P puts it: "Do you admit to us, O king, that you have put the same question to other recluses or to Brahmans?"[41] This is in fact the unmasking of the king, for the Buddha is bringing him to acknowledge that this is a test question. He then has Ajātaśatru recount his experiences with the other religious leaders, and it soon becomes clear that they have been tested and found wanting. The Buddha sees the challenge put to him and recognizes the task before him.

---

[41] Abhijānāsi no tvam, Mahārāja, imaṃ pañhaṃ aññe samaṇabrāhmaṇe pucchitā ti. DN I, 51. I believe Rhys Davids is correct to take abhijānāsi as "acknowledge, admit" rather than as "remember". Cf. Franke, trans., Dīghanikāya, p. 54, n. 2. The other versions all lack this verb.

The Buddha's reply will be considered later. It is sufficient to note here that while the king has a passive role in the ensuing dialogue, he is nevertheless intimately involved in working through the problem he has put before the Buddha. After the completion of the discourse he is satisfied that the test has been passed.

In the ancient text the extent of the king's conversion is not nearly as great as some of the later traditions report. Briefly, the following seems to be the case in the ancient text.[42] The king begins by taking refuge: he offers himself as a lay disciple in the Buddhist community, implying that he will go to the Buddha, the Doctrine and the Assembly for religious guidance, and that he will give help and material support to them. This is an act of faith and committment. Next, he acknowledges his past deed (his patricide) as evil and admits his blindness and stupidity in committing it. This is an act of confession. Then he expresses his desire to attain to self-control in the future and asks the Buddha to accept his confession.[43] This is an act of repentance and, perhaps, of seeking "forgiveness", although I am not certain that this latter term is appropriate. The Buddha then accepts his repentance and assures him that he is morally on the right path. It is fair to say that the conversion is a matter of gaining faith in the Buddha, release

---

[42]I follow P in the order of these events. It may be that a different order is more ancient but this would not greatly affect the discussion.

[43]Tassa me, Bhante, Bhagavā accayam accayato patigganhātu āyatim samvarāya. DN I, 85. There is no reason to believe that P has preserved the ancient wording exactly, but it cannot be too far off, for M's wording is very similar at this point.

from guilt, and moral regeneration and redirection. Whether or not profound moral improvement has been brought about is by no means clear,[44] and, what is more, it is definitely stated that the king has not won insight into the truths about the universe that are central to Buddhism. He has not attained the dharmacakṣu, the insight into the transitoriness of all things.[45] While this insight is by no means equivalent to final enlightenment, it is an essential first step in comprehension that sets one on the path to further understanding. Ajātaśatru's failure in this regard is directly due to his patricide. He is evidently already paying karmically for his evil action, for it has caused the obfuscation of his intellect.

Of the extant versions of the sutra, P has made the least changes relative to this theme. There is perhaps only one relevant addition to the ancient text, and this is the formula of praise for the Buddha's teaching put into the mouth of Ajātaśatru at the conclusion of the Buddha's discourse.[46] The formula is full of images of light and vision, which make it a generally appropriate vehicle for remarking on how the Buddha has brought one to discernment. But it is weak and awkward in the present case precisely because, as P itself testifies, the king

---

[44]When Ajātaśatru is encountered in circumstances posterior to this event he is seen to be as cunningly imperialistic as ever. See, for example, the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, DN II, 72ff.

[45]The dharmacakṣu is described as the insight that: yaṃ kinci samudayadhammaṃ sabbaṃ taṃ nirodhadhammaṃ (Rhys Davids: "Whatsoever has a beginning in that is inherent also the necessity of dissolution."). DN I, 110; Dialogues, I, 135.

[46]DN I, 85.

has not won significant insight through this discourse. Its awkwardness betrays its importation from other more suitable contexts. P, of all versions, ends most brusquely, with Ajātaśatru remarking that he must leave because he is busy and has much to do. This ending fits with the rather shallow spiritual attainment ascribed to him in this version. He has just received a discourse on the vanity of worldly things and the stages through which a man may renounce them and strive after higher goals: yet he tells the Buddha he is in a hurry, for he must get back to his secular affairs!

In C1 and M the conversion theme is altered somewhat through the addition of material in the introductory ("Beginning of the Narrative") and concluding ("Outcome and Conclusion") sections. The new introductory material not only adds color to the narrative but takes the text in the direction of universalization. That is, the plight of this specific king becomes the plight of everyone; the modes of action open to him become those open to everyone; the final solution to his problem, which Jīvaka (the ideal disciple of the Buddha) indicates, becomes the solution that ought to be adopted by everyone.

We are all troubled in mind, and when we ask the question, "What should I do?" there are always those around us quick to suggest things. Some will suggest immersion in sense pleasure and some will suggest winning power over others. Finally, some may suggest that we must seek not outside us but within us, and they may offer a variety of religious paths suited to helping us understand and reform ourselves. If we are fortunate, we may meet a disciple of the Buddha, the Truly Awakened One, who will direct us to the one who can give true wisdom

and peace. This is what these versions of the text are saying. The text, therefore, comes to provide a conversion archetype.

In line with this tendency, it is natural that the conversion be profound and the hearer genuinely changed by the Buddha's discourse. M is conservative in this regard and retains the limited conversion of the ancient text, but in C1 some changes have been made. The king still has not attained the dharmacaksu, but he has "removed a weighty offense," and "his transgression is diminished."[47] It is implied that he will not have to pay karmically for his evil action as he would have had to had he not come to the Buddha; it is not merely that he has cast off his crippling guilt (as in the ancient text), but rather that he has actually cast off his sin. In the text this is said to be a result of his repentance, but we suspect that it also depends upon the Buddha's acceptance of his repentance, an act that may here perhaps be justly called "forgiveness."

Finally, the addition of the meal episode in these two versions, while it adds nothing new to the conversion theme, does complete it and show us the king in his new role as upāsaka. The devotee is seen listening to and rejoicing in the Buddha's discourse on Dharma; the lay supporter is seen supporting the Buddha and the Assembly with material sustenance. This is a much more appropriate way to terminate the sutra than to have the king bustle abruptly back to his worldly affairs, provided one wants to show him as genuinely converted, and provided one wants the text to provide a conversion model.

---

[47]Above, pp. 48-49.

We might have expected that M would tie the events of the sutra very closely to the developed legend of Devadatta, for it is the deeds of the latter that are being recounted at this point in the Saṅghabheda-vastu. But such is not the case. There is only one addition to the ancient text that directly points to the developed legend:

> I have transgressed, Lord; I have transgressed, Sugata--in that, foolish, stupid, unintelligent and inept as I was, associating with a bad friend, fallen under the power of a bad friend, embraced by a bad friend, I put to death my father, that just man and just king.[48]

The "bad friend" (pāpamitra) referred to here is of course Devadatta. This lone reference, however, does not alter the fact that some of the versions from the Sūtra Piṭaka, where our text is simply one sutra among other and largely unrelated sutras, show more influence from the developed narrative than does M, which occurs in the midst of that narrative in the Vinaya Piṭaka.

C2, as compared with the two versions just discussed, shows less of the tendency toward universalization and more of the tendency to portray the king in the context of the developed legend. Ajātaśatru asks his councillors, "With what expedient can I dispel this dread?"[49] and this burning desire to attain peace of mind tends to overwhelm all other aspects of the text. As mentioned earlier, the question the king puts to the religious leaders directly expresses his personal need, with the result that the theme of the fruits of the śramaṇa's life is

---

[48]Above, p. 90.

[49]Above, p. 51.

thrown in the shade. No doubt this version is intended to speak to general problems and to make statements of general significance, but it is more concerned than C1 and M to show the way the Buddha was able to bring peace and liberation to this particular human being. For Ajātaśatru represented for the Buddhist tradition (after the development of the Devadatta narrative material) a very low level of humanity, having killed his father and attempted to kill the Buddha. The successful conversion of this depraved individual demonstrates clearly the power of the Buddha's "divine" salvific action.

Ajātaśatru's spiritual state subsequent to his conversion is described in C2 as follows:

> The king Ajātaśatru has already attained the receptivity of ordinary beings. Although he has killed a Law-king, he has completely done away with the imperfections and impurities and is free from the Outflows. He is established in the Law and will not regress. On this very seat the eye for dharmas, which is far from dust and free of impurity, has arisen [in him].[50]

There are three major statements made here. First, the king is said to have reached "the receptivity of ordinary beings." This seems to correspond to the "faith of ordinary beings" (pothujjanikā saddhā) ascribed to Ajātaśatru in the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī.[51] Although I do not know the exact implications of this term, it seems to point to a rather low level of devotion without insight. Second, the king is said to have "done away with the imperfections and impurities," the precise meaning

---

[50] Above, p. 69.

[51] Sumaṅgala., 238.

of which is not clear to me, and to be "free from the Outflows." The Outflows, of course, are the āsravas. The problem here is that in Small Vehicle Buddhism the state of freedom from the āsravas is generally equated with the highest attainable spiritual state, that of Arhatship. The third statement made is that Ajātaśatru is established firmly in the Law and that he has attained the dharmacakṣu. This is a coherent statement in itself, suggesting that he is securely in the Buddhist path even though he has just set his feet on it; it is what we would expect if he is a srotāpanna, or "stream-enterer."[52] To sum up: the first statement gives the king a low grade of religious attainment; the third puts him rather higher; the second puts him much higher than both of these, apparently crediting him with the attainment of the final goal. Obviously the three statements do not fit, but betray a process of awkward change and development in the textual tradition.

It may be shocking to see the exalted attainments given here to Ajātaśatru, but it is important to remember that they are not really his attainments but the Buddha's. It is the latter who has brought about this radical spiritual change, and he has done so not because of the richness of the king's spiritual state but despite its poverty.

Throughout the next version of the text, C3, the details of the developed legend are assumed as background. When Jīvaka recommends the Buddha to Ajātaśatru it is not a case of persuading him to visit a teacher whom he has never met and of whose worth he is unsure: it

---

[52] Below, p. 232.

is a case of overcoming his hesitancy to approach the Teacher whom he knows well and against whom he has committed the most outrageous acts. It is only by extolling the Buddha's dispassionate mind that Jīvaka is able to persuade the king to go. And from this point on there is no doubt whatsoever that he is going to seek forgiveness and to take refuge. It is likely that the abridgement of the Buddha's discourse is in part due to its superfluity in this version. The king does not need to be brought to faith, for he has it from the outset; there is no doubt in his mind and no testing of the Buddha is required. One might almost say that there is no conversion--that the king needs only to be given the opportunity to take refuge. In all of this it is the specific situation of Ajātaśatru that is at issue, as was the case in C2, but the present text shows tendencies toward universalization as well, both in its introductory section (regarding which the earlier comments on the parallel sections of C1 and M are pertinent) and in its new form of the king's question. For the question about the fruits of the śramaṇa's life is gone, and in its place is a question about the fruits of meritorious action in general. The sutra is thus concerned not with the actions of the monk, but with the actions of men in general.

As to the spiritual attainments of Ajātaśatru subsequent to the Buddha's discourse, C3 is fairly conservative, like P and M, except that it affirms that he has "seized a great good fortune, and acquired the faith without roots."[53] The tradition regarding this

---

[53]Above, p. 89.

acquisition is widespread[54] and, while it may be connected to the tradition that he has acquired the "faith of ordinary beings," it apparently signifies that the Buddha has brought about faith in him despite the fact that he had wholly extirpated his "good roots" (kuśalamūlāni) through his previous evil actions.

Buddhaghosa's commentary on P, the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, is roughly contemporary with the recording of C1, C2 and C3 in the Chinese language,[55] and one would expect that it would make use of the relevant developed narrative material as was found to be the case with these texts. This turns out to be the case. Furthermore, since a commentator has much more freedom in his use of such material than does a simple transmitter of scripture (provided the transmitter has a degree of respect for his text in its received form), it is not surprising that the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī contains far more of it than any of the versions of the sutra itself. It is worth examining Buddhaghosa's attempt to interpret P, which is close to the ancient text and does not reveal knowledge of the developed legend, in light of this material. In addition it will be found that the commentary is of assistance in a variety of ways in our attempt to understand the significance of the text and to disengage its themes.

---

[54] Above, pp. 15, 17, 28, n. 44.

[55] Buddhaghosa flourished in the fifth century A.D. (W. Geiger, Pāli Literature and Language [Calcutta: Calcutta University Press, 1943], p. 28). We do not know the exact dates of his commentaries.

Near the beginning of his commentary on this sutra Buddhaghosa gives, under the pretext of an explanation of Ajātaśatru's name, a substantial summary of the story of the liason between Devadatta and Ajātaśatru, including the account of Bimbisāra's death.[56] This establishes context for the ensuing events.

In P, the section introducing the king says that he "was seated on the upper terrace roof of his palace surrounded by his ministers."[57] Buddhaghosa takes the apparently straightforward words "he was seated" (<u>nisinno hoti</u>) and comments:

> And why seated? So that he might keep from falling asleep. For since the day when the king first moved against his father, whenever he tried to go to sleep he would awaken in fear as soon as his eyes were closed, crying out as if struck with a hundred spears.[58]

Thus does the commentator implant the details of the developed story within the rather austere text of P, giving the hidden causes and motives for seemingly innocent actions and words. Another example of the process is his commentary on the king's question as to what religious leader he should visit on this day:[59] he explains that the whole point of this question is to give a hint to Jīvaka so that the latter might recommend a visit to the Buddha. The king, we are told, knows from the outset

---

[56] <u>Sumaṅgala</u>., 133-139.

[57] Rhys Davids' translation, <u>Dialogues</u>, I, 66.

[58] Kasmā nisinno? Niddā-vinodanattham. Ayaṃ hi rājā pitari upakkanta-divasato paṭṭhāya 'Niddaṃ okkamissāmīti', nimīlitamattesu yeva akkhīsu satti-sata-samabbhāhato viya kandamāno bhayā va pabujjhati ...<u>Sumaṅgala</u>., 140.

[59] <u>Sumaṅgala</u>., 141-142.

whom he wishes to see, but because of the great sins he has committed against the Buddha he needs Jīvaka's sponsorship and cannot simply go on his own initiative. Thus does the Theravādin tradition of the fifth century A.D. show the same tendencies as the other traditions at the same point in time. The king sets out in penitence and faith to see the Buddha. There is no question of his putting the latter to the test, and his conversion is already underway.

When Jīvaka recommends the Buddha, P simply reports the king as responding: "Then, friend Jīvaka, have the riding-elephants made ready."[60] In contrast to this, some of the other versions include some indication of the king's happiness at the suggestion. C3, for example, tells us that he is "joyful and delighted,"[61] and goes on to have him praise Jīvaka for the suggestion. As for Buddhaghosa, he is not inhibited by the lack of emotion in P, and informs us that when Ajātaśatru heard the praise of the Buddha "his entire body was at once shot through with five kinds of joy."[62]

This sort of exaltation of the Buddha prior to the latter's discourse shows the inevitability of the conversion and suggests that the discourse itself is not crucial. The Buddha can exert his saving influence on the king without the mundane affair of teaching. This

---

[60] Rhys Davids' translation, Dialogues, I, 67. (Tena hi, samma Jīvaka, hatthiyānāni kappāpehi. DN I, 49)

[61] Above, p. 76.

[62] Rañño pi Bhagavato guṇa-kathaṃ suṇantassa sakala-sarīraṃ pañca-vaṇṇāya pītiyā nirantaraṃ phuṭaṃ ahosi. Sumaṅgala., 146.

exaltation tendency can be seen at work in various texts, but P has relatively little of it. That this is an indication of the antiquity of P, rather than of its simply being the property of the Theravādin tradition, is suggested by Buddhaghosa's comment on the king's question: "But where, good Jīvaka, is the Lord?"[63]

> Why does he ask this? Some say he really does not know. [They say:] 'He is supposed to have seen the Buddha before when as a child he visited him with his father, but since the time of his great sin, when in association with a bad friend he killed his father, sent the assassins and loosed [the elephant] Dhanapālaka, he has not actually met the Buddha face to face. So he asks because he does not recognize him.' This, however, is not the reason. The Lord is sitting in the middle of the pavilion surrounded by the assembly of monks, like the full moon surrounded by the stars, covered with the excellent signs and adorned with the secondary characteristics, illuminating the entire grove with six-coloured rays of light. Who indeed would not know him? It is, rather, from kingly decorum that he asks the question. It is the custom in royal families that one asks as though in ignorance when in fact one knows.
>
> Hearing him, Jīvaka thinks: 'This king, although standing right before the Dasabala, asks where the Lord is! It is as if he stood on the earth and asked where the earth was, or looked up at the sky and asked where the sun and moon were, or stood at the foot of Mt. Sineru and asked where Mt. Sineru was!'[64]

---

[63] Kahaṃ pana, samma Jīvaka, Bhagavā ti. DN I, 50.

[64] Kasmā pucchati? Eke tāva ajānanto ti vadanti. 'Iminā kira dahara-kāle pitarā saddhiṃ āgamma Bhagavā diṭṭha-pubbo. Pacchā pana pāpa-mitta-saṃsaggena pitu-ghātaṃ katvā abhimāre pesetvā dhanapālakaṃ muncāpetvā mahāparādho hutvā Bhagavato sammukhī-bhāvaṃ na upagata-pubbo ti asañjānanto pucchatīti.' Taṃ akāraṇaṃ. Bhagavā hi ākiṇṇa-vara-lakkhaṇo anuvyañjana-patimaṇḍito chabbaṇṇāhi rasmīhi sakala-ārāmaṃ obhāsetvā, tārā-gaṇa-parivuto viya puṇṇa-cando, bhikkhu-gaṇa-parivuto maṇḍaḷa-māḷa-majjhe nisinno. Taṃ ko nāma na jāneyya? Ayam pana attano issariyā-līḷhāya pucchati. Pakati h'esā rāja-kulānaṃ, yaṃ sañjānantā pi ajānantā viya pucchanti. Jīvaka pana taṃ sutvā, 'Ayaṃ rājā paṭhaviyaṃ ṭhatvā "Kuhim pathavīti", nabhaṃ oloketvā "Kuhiṃ candima-sūriyā" ti, Sineru-mūle ṭhatvā "Kuhiṃ Sinerūti" vadamāno viya, Dasabalassa purato va ṭhatvā "Kuhiṃ Bhagavā" ti pucchati. Sumaṅgala., 152.

This commentarial passage is an eloquent testimony to the "exaltation tendencies" at work in the Theravādin tradition between the time P was fixed and the composition of the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī.

This section may be concluded with a consideration of how Buddhaghosa deals with the king's spiritual state after his conversion. The commentator is faced with a dilemma. On the one hand, his scriptural text says plainly that the king has ruined himself through his evil action and not attained the insight he otherwise would have attained; on the other hand, this seems to put undesirable limits on the Buddha's salvific power. To begin with, then, we are told that had the king not killed his father he would have attained the sotāpattimagga (the level of the so-called "stream-enterer"); as it is, however, he is destined to descend through the hells for a long time before he will be able to make his way upward again.[65] Thus is the statement of the power of karma retained. But Buddhaghosa is not content to end on this note, and he adds:

> But having heard this sutra what profit has the king gained? He has gained great profit. For since the time when he killed his father he was unable to sleep, whether in the day or night, but after he approached the Teacher and heard this sweet and strength-giving discourse on Dhamma, he was able to sleep. He went on to pay great honour to the Three Treasures. There was no one endowed with the faith of ordinary people as he was. And in the future, having become a Paccekabuddha by the name of Viditavisesa, he shall attain Parinibbāna.[66]

---

[65] Sumaṅgala., 237-238.

[66] Imam pana suttaṃ sutvā rañño ko ānisaṅso laddho? Mahā ānisaṅso laddho. Ayaṃ hi pitu-mārita-kālato paṭṭhāya n'eva rattiṃ na divā niddhaṃ labhati. Satthāraṃ pana upasaṃkamitvā imāya madhurāya ojavatiyā Dhamma-desanāya suta-kālato paṭṭhāya niddhaṃ labhi. Tiṇṇaṃ ratanānaṃ mahā-sakkāraṃ akāsi. Pothujjanikāya saddhāya samannāgato nāma iminā raññā sadiso nāma nāhosi. Anāgate pana Vidita-viseso nāma Pacceka-Buddho hutvā parinibbāyis-satīti. Sumaṅgala., 238.

In this way Buddhaghosa gives the king some immediate profit, however humble spiritually, and gives him complete release as a final achievement. This ultimate achievement is assumed to be the result of the encounter with the Buddha described in the present sutra, as well as of the honour the king later paid to the Three Treasures (which was itself a result of the present encounter). So, in the end, the commentator vidicates both the power of karma and the power of the Buddha.

The Theme of Peace

In the ancient text and all subsequent versions the theme of peace is of great importance. In brief, it is peace that the king lacks and that he sets out to find; it is peace that he discovers in the Buddha and the Assembly; it is peace that he finally attains as a result of this religious encounter. One has to look carefully, however, to see how this theme is expressed in the sutra, for it is not given as explicitly as the former two themes.

The ancient text begins by having the king, on this beautifully moonlit poṣadha night, express his desire to visit a religious leader so that his "heart may attain peace."[67] To be sure, the expression cittam pasīdeyya has been seen to be rich in its implications, but this is certainly its central meaning in the context, as later events show. In response to this question the adherents of the heretical sects are quick to recommend their teachers at some length. Only Jīvaka says

[67]Above, pp. 217ff.

nothing. Why should the one person with a worthwhile recommendation remain silent at this point? The answer is that silence is a frequent symbol of inner mastery and peace in early Buddhist texts, and it is found to have this same symbolic value in our sutra.

Reference to other works in the early canon where this symbolism is employed may here be helpful. Consider the following passage from the Sandaka Sutta:

> Then the venerable Ānanda, together with many monks, approached Devakaṭa Pool. Now at that time the wanderer Sandaka was sitting down with the great company of wanderers shouting out with a loud noise, a great noise, talking various kinds of inferior talk, that is to say talk on kings, thieves, great ministers, armies, fears, battles, food, drink, clothes, beds, garlands, scents, relations, vehicles, villages, market towns, towns, the country, women, heroes, streets, wells, those departed before, talk of diversity, speculation about the world, speculation about the sea, talk about becoming or not becoming thus or thus. The wanderer Sandaka saw the venerable Ānanda coming in the distance; seeing him, he called his own company to order saying:
>
> 'Good sirs, let there be little noise; do not, good sirs, make a noise; this is a disciple of the recluse Gotama who is coming--the recluse Ānanda. For as long as disciples of the recluse Gotama have been staying near Kosambī the recluse Ānanda has been among them. These venerable ones wish for little noise, they are trained to little noise, they are praisers of little noise. So he may consider approaching if he knows that this is a company of little noise.' Then these wanderers fell silent. Then the venerable Ānanda approached the wanderer Sandaka.[68]

---

[68]MN I, 513-514. There is apparently no sutra directly corresponding to this one preserved in Chinese, but the episode in question is common enough. See the following note.

This episode occurs with minor variations quite frequently in the early canon.[69] Always the Buddha or one of his disciples, monk or lay, approaches parivrājakas of other sects. The latter are characterized as noisy and disorderly, given to disputation of vain and low topics. The Buddha and his disciples are portrayed as well-known for their love of silence, and as willing to approach other assemblies only if they are silent. It is clear that for the early Buddhists noise was indicative of attachment to external things, of a low spiritual state, and of inner chaos and agitation; silence was a sign of self mastery and peace. In view of the way passages such as the one above delight in contrasting the love of noise displayed by the followers of false religious leaders with the love of silence shown by the disciples of the Lord, Jīvaka's silence in the midst of the noisy followers of the six heretics is an important symbolic statement. This interpretation is confirmed by Buddhaghosa's commentary on the passage. He has Ajātaśatru, after the speeches to the heretical disciples, reflect to himself: "Jīvaka is a follower of the quiescent Lord Buddha, and is thus himself quiescent. Hence he sits in silence like a well disciplined monk and will not speak until I have spoken."[70]

The journey to the Buddha contributes further to the present theme, for we are given a chance to see the king's inner turmoil and lack of peace. Having set out confidently in great pomp he is suddenly

---

[69]See, for example, the Mahāsakuludāyi Sutta, MN II, 1ff. (T.26: vol. 1, pp. 781ff.) and the Samaṇamaṇḍikā Sutta, MN II, 22ff. (T.26: vol. 1, pp. 720f.).

[70]Jīvako upasantassa Buddhassa Bhagavato upaṭṭhāko, sayam pi upasanto. Tasmā vatta-sampanno bhikkhu viya tuṇhī bhūto nisinno, na esa mayi akathente kathessati. Sumaṅgala., 145.

overcome with fear, distrustful of Jīvaka and certain that his enemies will deal with him as, given the chance, he would deal with them. It should especially be noted that the very thing that causes his fear is quietude. His suspicions are aroused by the utter silence in the grove ahead, where a great company is supposed to be residing. He cannot believe that such lack of noise is possible; he cannot understand peace.

When Ajātaśatru approaches the Buddha the following takes place:

> And as he stood there and looked on the assembly, seated in perfect silence, calm as a clear lake, he broke out: 'Would that my son, Udāyi Bhadda, might have such calm as this assembly of the brethren now has!'[71]

Here the connection between the silence of the Assembly (tuṇhī-bhūtaṃ bhikkhu-saṅghaṃ) and its calm or peace(upasama) is made explicit. In addition, it is compared to a lake that is "vippasanna". This term means "serene", suggesting both clarity and calm, and it is particularly well chosen in that it is etymologically related to pasāda (and the relevant verbal forms).[72] The king has come so that his heart might become serene (cittaṃ pasīdeyya), and immediately upon his arrival he is overwhelmed by the serenity of the Buddhist Saṅgha.

---

[71]Rhys Davids' translation, Dialogues, I, 68. Ekamantaṃ ṭhito kho rājā Māgadho Ajātasattu Vedhiputto tuṇhībhūtaṃ bhikkhusaṅghaṃ anuviloketvā rahadamiva vippasannaṃ, udānaṃ udānesi: "Iminā me upasamena Udayabhaddo kumāro samannāgato hotu yenetarahi upasamena bhikkhusaṅgho samannāgato ti. DN I, 51.

[72]From the root sad.

As far as Udāyi Bhadra is concerned, the ancient text offers no explanation, and we can only assume that the father is afraid that his son is or will become like himself, in constant agitation in his desire for conquest. If this is so, Ajātaśatru's wish for his son's peace is at the same time a wish for his own peace.

The recounting of the visits to the six heretics has little to do directly with this theme, except, of course, that the king is dissatisfied with each of these religious leaders and obviously does not attain the prasāda for which he is seeking.

At the conclusion of the events described in the sutra the king certainly attains peace, but of a specific and limited kind. It is possible to make a distinction between two kinds or levels of peace, with regard to both this sutra and early Buddhist literature in general. The lower level can be attained spontaneously in a reaction of faith and love evoked by the Buddha, by a reliquary (stūpa), or by other sacred persons and objects. The term prasāda (and the various related forms) is typically expressive of this first kind of peace.[73] The higher level, referred to with words such as śamatha, is usually reserved for those who have gone forth from home, is closely connected with self restraint and meditation, and is a product of strenuous self cultivation.[74] The peace (upaśama) of the Assembly is of the higher kind; what Ajātaśatru attains is of the lower kind. He takes

---

[73]See, for example, the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, DN II, 141ff.

[74]See, for example, the Ākaṅkheyya Sutta, MN I, 33.

refuge (*śaraṇa*--protection, shelter) in the Three Treasures; he obtains faith and casts off his burden of guilt.

The theme of peace is recognized and retained in all extant versions of the text and in most cases few changes have been made with regard to it. P, however, is unique in having the king remain silent after each of the recommendations of the heretical teachers. If silence is a symbol of peace in this sutra, is it not symbolically inconsistent to describe the king as silent? Perhaps. But it remains true, at least, that silence has a positive value: it is to the king's credit that he is quiet at this point. The noise of the disciples of the false teachers is faced with the silence of the king: they are in error and he recognizes it. Buddhaghosa compares Ajātaśatru to a man who reaches out in hunger for a golden, sweet-juiced mango, but who instead finds in his hand only dried up, left over fruit.[75] So the king's perceptivity is shown by his silence.

In C1, C3 and M, Udāyi Bhadra is included in the king's company and is made to suggest a military expedition for the night's entertainment. This makes the king's reference to him later less confusing, and our hypothesis is confirmed that Udāyi Bhadra's lack of peace is similar to his father's, being the result of feverish desire for conquest. Furthermore, all of these texts, as opposed to P, have Jīvaka interpret for the king the silence of the company in the grove, and the interpre-

---

[75] Suvaṇṇa-vaṇṇaṃ madhu-rasaṃ ambapakkaṃ khāditu-kāmo puriso āharitvā hatthe ṭhapita-kājara-pakkaṃ disvā viya...*Sumaṅgala*., 143.

tation is in each case that it is indicative of self control, inner mastery, and peace.[76]

Of all the versions of the sutra, however, it is C2 that takes the theme of peace most seriously. It begins by referring to the king as filled with anxiety, dread and worry, leaving us in no doubt about his religious needs.[77] Then, when Jīvaka recommends the Buddha he does so with the following words: "If you wish to alleviate your burning, forget your worries and get rid of your troubles: the Buddha, the World Honoured One, together with a company of disciples, is presently residing in my plum grove."[78] This leaves no doubt about the purpose of the visit. On the journey to the Buddha the king, on being told that there are twelve hundred and fifty men in the grove ahead, exclaims:

> I hope you are not deceiving me, having me leave the capital that I might meet with peril on the way? Whenever I have gone to the deluded men of heterodox persuasion, where they had a company of five hundred men there was always a din being given off. Yet now these bhikṣus are many and I hear no sound.[79]

This addition is reminiscent of the passage from the Sandaka Sutta quoted above, where silence is symbolic of true as opposed to false

---

[76]Above, p. 35 (C1); p. 79 (C3); pp. 92-93 (C4).

[77]Above, pp. 51ff.

[78]Above, p. 52.

[79]Above, p. 53.

religiosity, inner control as opposed to inner chaos. Whether the sutra is improved by making this point explicitly rather than implicitly is doubtful.

In his reassurance of the king, Jīvaka says: "It is simply that the Buddha, the World Honoured One, has for a long time been tranquil, while his disciples are bent on mastering the Law and are hence quiet."[80] And when Ajātaśatru reaches the Buddha he remarks: "The Buddha's mind is tranquil, and wondrously free of [distracting] thoughts; his disciples are likewise. I pray you help my mind to be set on such wondrous stillness as this!"[81] The prayer is no longer for Udāyi Bhadra, but for the king himself. This change may be based on a textual corruption, but in any case it moves in the direction of increased emphasis on the king's specific spiritual state (characterized by lack of peace), which is the general tendency of C2.

As remarked previously, the question the king asks of the religious leaders is also made to partake of this tendency, and the theme of the fruits of the life of a *śramaṇa* consequently fades into the background. The second formulation of the question is the most revealing in this regard:

> Perhaps for my own sake I seek peace and tranquillity or perhaps for the sake of father and mother, wife and children, male and female slaves. I make offering to *śramaṇas* and *brāhmaṇas*, giving to them with the highest service: shall I really in this way attain to the realization of the end of this religious system, and enter the path of peace?[82]

---

[80]Above, p. 54.

[81]Above, p. 55.

[82]Above, p. 57.

The king is no longer interested in the furits of the śramaṇa's activity, but rather in whether he can "enter the path of peace". We are fortunate to be able to perceive the means whereby this important shift has been accomplished in the transmission of the text. C2 is in Chinese entitled 寂志果經, literally, "The Sutra on the Fruits of [the Life of] One Intent on Tranquillity." 寂志 ("one intent on tranquillity") is a way of translating "śramaṇa" into Chinese. More properly, it is a way of translating Prakrit samaṇa, for the whole point of the translation is that the term is considered to be connected with tranquillity, and it is obvious that the Prakrit samaṇa is here considered as deriving from the root sam = Skt. śam ("to be calm, tranquil") rather than from the root saṃ = Skt. śram ("to toil, to exert or weary oneself").[83] In the last line of the king's question as given above the crucial term 寂 is again used, and it is consequently very likely that this business of entering the path of peace is connected with some such reading as sāmanaphala (= Skt. śāmanaphala, "the fruit of tranquillity") in place of the earlier sāmaññaphala (= Skt. śrāmaṇyaphala, "the fruit of the life of a śramaṇa"). I do not believe this change to be the result of simple error, for elsewhere in the text one finds the usual Chinese transliteration of śramaṇa (沙門),[84] and unambiguous reference

---

[83] See PTSD s.v. samaṇa. See also Mochizuki's dictionary s.v. 沙門: Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten 望月佛教大辭典 (Kyoto: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1954-63), vol. 3, pp. 2180ff.

[84] Actually, this common form too seems originally to have been derived from Prakrit rather than Sanskrit.

is made later to "the fruits of the life of a *śramaṇa*."[85] The transmitters of the text, therefore, seem to have used the flexibility of the Prakrit medium rather consciously to effect the desired changes in emphasis.

This interpretation of the term *samaṇa* is by no means a trivial matter, and ought not to be dismissed as "fanciful etymologizing." It may be fanciful, but it is expressive of something of great importance to the tradition, as can be seen from the fact that this derivation from *sam* = Skt. *śam* is a common one.[86] The point is that the Buddha has chosen the Middle Path and is not interested in promoting the older forms of ascetic toil and striving such as are suggested by the word "*śramaṇa*". Austerities as such are of no value, and what is required is self mastery leading to cessation and peace. There is no reason to think that the Buddhists arrived at this derivation of the term *samaṇa* through an unsophisticated blunder. Everything points to a deliberate attempt to make a statement about the position of Buddhism with regard to the *śramaṇa* movement in general.

C2 continues to highlight the theme of peace in later passages. After Ajita Keśakambalin's unhelpful speech Ajātaśatru remarks: "Where shall I find a *śramaṇa* or *brāhmaṇa* who can set my mind at ease and cause it to cease from worry?"[87] And finally, after his taking of

---

[85]For example: 沙門得道之證.T.22: vol. 1, p. 271c, 22.

[86]PTSD *s.v. samaṇa* and *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. 3, pp. 2180ff.

[87]Above, p. 60.

refuge with the Buddha he thanks Jīvaka for leading him to the Buddha, saying: "I have been released from my sinful transgression and have had a weighty fault made light."[88] Despite the rather confused and corrupt state of the text in C2, therefore, literary unity is achieved through the theme of peace. As the title of this version indicates, it is indeed concerned with "the fruits of the life of one intent on tranquillity".

Turning to the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, we find Buddhaghosa's comments relative to this theme very interesting. Several of them have already been referred to. (Ajātaśatru's silence is explained as due to his perception of the unworthiness of the six heretics; Jīvaka's silence is due to his tranquillity, as a disciple of a master who dwells in peace.) In dealing with the king's journey to the Buddha the following simple but extremely suggestive remarks are made. "The Lord loves little noise" (appa-sadda-kāmo Bhagavā), he says, whereas "kings take delight in noise" (rājāno ca nāma saddābhiratā honti).[89] The implications of these statements will be considered under the heading of the next theme.

In his portrayal of the silent Assembly the king encounters when he approaches the Buddha,[90] Buddhaghosa paints a colorful picture. Not a single monk, he tells us, moves hand or foot out of place. Although

---

[88] Above, p. 69.

[89] Sumaṅgala., 150.

[90] Ibid., 152-153.

the king and his company are strikingly outfitted and in full view, the monks pay them no heed but keep their eyes fastened on the Buddha. The monks' silence here is seen as implying not only mastery and peace in the attainment of one-mindedness, but also an attitude of respect toward the Buddha bordering on devotion. On two occasions the commentator describes Ajātaśatru as having pasāda in the silent Assembly.[91] He appears to wish to suggest all three aspects of this term: faith, clarity and peace.

The explanation of the prayer for Udāyi Bhadra is as follows.[92] It is not that the king hopes his son will renounce the household life and attain peace such as is possessed by the monks, but rather that he fears and distrusts his son. He is afraid that when Udāyi Bhadra (assumed here to be but a child at the time of these events) asks where his grandfather is and is told that the latter was killed by his son (Ajātaśatru), he will decide that he too should put his father to death that he might rule the kingdom himself. This confirms our earlier impression that Ajātaśatru is not wishing for his son tranquillity in the deep religious sense, but simply freedom from the thirst for power. Again it seems fair to say that the wish is for Ajātaśatru too, for he and his son are both similarly subject to their own murderous drives. Buddhaghosa adds that despite this wish Ajātaśatru was in fact eventually put to death by his son, who in turn fell to his son.[93]

---

[91] Ibid., 153.

[92] Ibid.

[93] Ibid. Buddhaghosa says that this line of kings was finally destroyed by a disgusted populace.

Finally, Buddhaghosa transmits the legendary material concerning the king's inability to sleep due to fear and guilt.[94] After taking refuge with the Buddha he is finally able to sleep. In this way his attainment of peace of the lower sort is expressed. And by predicting his ultimate achievement of Nirvāṇa (as a Pratyekabuddha) Buddhaghosa gives him the attainment of peace of the higher sort as well.

Internal and External Mastery

The contrast between external and internal mastery is common in early Buddhist literature, and is expressive of the fundamental choice seen to confront all men, that between turning outward in an attempt to satisfy one's thirst for sense-gratification and dominance of others, and turning inward to come to grips with the forces and powers within one's person.

In Buddhist literature this contrast is frequently symbolized with the figures of the king (representing external mastery) and the śramaṇa (representing internal mastery). The latter is often, but not always, the Mahāśramaṇa, the Buddha. The choice of these figures is easy to understand. The king was one distinguished by his control over others and his access to every manner of sense pleasure; furthermore, the empire-building kings of the period in question, such as Ajātaśatru, were especially apt symbols of external grasping. The śramaṇa, on the other hand, was one who had left his home and cut his social ties,

---

[94]Above, pp. 229, 232.

determined to conquer himself rather than others. The Buddha-legend is the best known context for the employment of these symbols. The young child, in the developed form of the story, is predicted to become either a universal monarch (cakravartin) or a Buddha. The power of the ensuing narrative is due in large part to the tension between these two ideals. In the end, Gautama must reject his royal destiny completely: there is no possibility of choosing both paths. In Aśvaghoṣa's Buddhacarita the Bodhisattva puts it succinctly:

> As for the tradition that kings obtained final emancipation while remaining in their homes, this is not the case. How can the dharma of salvation in which quietude predominates be reconciled with the dharma of kings in which severity of action predominates?
>
> If a king delights in quietude, his kingdom collapses; if his mind turns to his kingdom, his quietude is ruined. For quietude and severity are incompatible, like the union of water which is cold with fire which is hot.[95]

In the early canon one finds a variety of means of expressing the present theme, ranging from the simple statements of the Dhammapada ("If a man were to conquer in battle a thousand times a thousand men

---

[95]E. H. Johnston, trans., The Buddhacarita (Delhi: Motilal Banrsidass, 1972), Part II, p. 133. The Sanskrit (ibid., Part I, p. 101) is:

yā ca śrutir mokṣam avāptavanto
  nṛpā gṛhasthā iti naitad asti

śamapradhānaḥ kva ca mokṣadharmo
  daṇḍapradhānaḥ kva ca rājadharmaḥ

śame ratiś cec chithilaṃ ca rājyaṃ
  rājye matiś cec chamaviplavaś ca

śamaś ca taikṣṇyaṃ ca hi nopapannam
  śītoṣṇayor aikyam ivodakāgnyoḥ

and another conquer one, himself, he indeed is the greatest of conquerors")[96] to the powerfully articulated narrative of Kṣāntivādin. Since it is most illuminative of this theme, the latter may here be briefly considered. Although this story had wide currency in Buddhist countries for centuries and has survived in a number of forms,[97] the Pali Khantivādi Jātaka[98] gives clearest expression to the particular contrast at issue here and hence will be used in the present discussion.

The background of the dramatic confrontation between the ascetic and the king that is the high point of the story may be summarized as follows. The ascetic (identified as the Bodhisatta in a previous existence), a man who has attained great self discipline and mindfulness, comes to reside in a royal park. One day Kalābu, the king of Kāsi, enters the park with a retinue. Even as the ascetic is the very picture of inwardness and self mastery, the king is the image of lust after external things. Drunk with wine and surrounded by dancing girls he finally falls asleep with his head in the lap of one of his women. The women who had been entertaining him leave him to amuse themselves in the grove, where they come upon the ascetic seated beneath a tree.

---

[96] Yo sahassaṃ sahassena saṅgāme mānuse jine ekaṃ ca jeyya attānaṃ sa ve saṅgāmajuttamo. The Pali and the English translation are from S. Radhakrishnan, ed. and trans., The Dhammapada (London: Oxford University Press, 1950), p. 94, v. 4.

[97] See E. Chavannes, trans., Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripitaka chinois (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1962) IV, 113-114.

[98] The translation used here is that of H. T. Francis, from E. B. Cowell, ed., The Jātaka (London: Luzac & Co., 1969), III, 26-29. The Pali is from M. Fausbøll, ed., The Jātaka (London: Luzac & Co., 1962-64), III, 39-43.

They sit around him in a circle and he gives them a religious discourse. When the king awakens and discovers that he has been abandoned in favour of an ascetic he is filled with rage, takes hold of his sword, and advances to where the ascetic is seated. The following drama then takes place:

> Then those of the women that were most in favour, when they saw the king coming in a rage, went and took the sword from the king's hand and pacified him. Then he came and stood by the Bodhisatta and asked, 'What doctrine are you preaching, Monk?' 'The doctrine of patience, Your Majesty,' he replied. 'What is this patience?' said the king. 'The not being angry, when men abuse you and strike you and revile you.' Said the king, 'I will now see the reality of your patience,' and he summoned his executioner. And he in the way of his office took an axe and a scourge of thorns, and clad in a yellow robe and wearing a red garland, came and saluted the king and said, 'What is your pleasure, Sire?' 'Take and drag off this vile rogue of an ascetic,' said the king, 'and throwing him on the ground, with your lash of thorns scourge him before and behind and on both sides, and give him two thousand stripes.' This was done. And the Bodhisatta's outer and inner skins were cut through to the flesh, and the blood flowed. The king again asked, 'What doctrine do you preach, Monk?' 'The doctrine of patience, Your Highness,' he replied. 'You fancy that my patience is only skin deep. It is not skin deep, but is fixed within my heart, where it cannot be seen by you, Sire.' Again the executioner asked, 'What is your pleasure, Sire?' The king said, 'Cut off the hands of this false ascetic.' So he took his axe, and placing the victim within the fatal circle, he cut off both his hands. Then the king said, 'Off with his feet,' and his feet were chopped off. And the blood flowed from the extremities of his hands and feet like lac juice from a leaking jar. Again the king asked what doctrine he preached. 'The doctrine of patience, Your Highness,' he replied. 'You imagine, Sire, that my patience dwells in the extremities of my hands and feet. It is not there, but it is deep seated somewhere else.' The king said, 'Cut off his nose and ears.'

> The executioner did so. His whole body was now covered with blood. Again the king asked of his doctrine. And the ascetic said, 'Think not that my patience is seated in the tips of my nose and ears: my patience is deep seated within my heart.' The king said: 'Lie down, false Monk, and thence exalt your patience.' And so saying, he struck the Bodhisatta above the heart with his foot, and betook himself off.[99]

Although this story is often regarded as concerned with portraying a particular virtue, that of forbearance (kṣānti), it in fact gives vigorous expression to the contrast between external and internal mastery.

The first action in the confrontation of the two chief actors is the king's laying hold of his sword. When aroused, his mind runs at once to external force. Yet both his anger, (provoked by jealousy) and his sword are really unnecessary, for the ascetic is completely unmoved by the beauty of the king's women. The king's mental state and his action are, therefore, the result of his failure to understand internal mastery and what it implies. When he asks the śramaṇa what he professes (kiṃvādī tvaṃ samaṇa), the latter answers the challenge directly, saying that he professes forbearance (khantivādī mahārāja) and going on to define this forbearance as "the not being angry, when men abuse you and strike you and revile you" (akkosantesu paharantesu paribhāsantesu akujjhanabhāvo). A conflict then takes place between the king, who literally tries to beat the ascetic's forbearance (self control) out of him, and the śramaṇa, who defies each blow and maintains his self control intact. After each act of violence the king asks the

---

[99]Cowell, ed., ibid., pp. 27-28.

śramaṇa what he professes and the latter reaffirms his forbearance (*khantivādī mahārāja*). The king attempts by external means to reach deeper and deeper into the ascetic's person. He cuts through the outer skin, the inner skin and the flesh in that order (*Bodhisattassa chavi chijji, cammaṃ chijji, maṃsaṃ chijji*) and then begins on his hands and feet. But the ascetic says that his forbearance is not to be located in any of these places, nor can it be seen by the king, for it is located deep within his heart (*mama khanti gambhīre hadayabbhantare patiṭṭhita*). The king, however, does not understand what he is being told, having had no experience of the internal realm himself, and he continues to grope within the ascetic's physical self, trying to reach his inwardness. In a parting gesture, he kicks the ascetic in the heart (*Bodhisattam hadaye pādena paharitvā*): the *śramaṇa* has said that his forbearance resides in his heart, and the king imagines him to be speaking of the physical organ. In the end, of course, the king goes to Hell for his deeds, and although the ascetic dies as a result of the encounter there is no question but that he was considered by the tradition as the winner of the battle. For the Buddhists the superiority of internal mastery was taken for granted.

Now the *Khantivādi Jātaka* and the *Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra* may seem to have little in common, but I believe that the latter text, while it does not express the contrast between the two types of mastery as forcefully and systematically as the former, cannot be fully understood if this theme is ignored. Let us now consider the sutra more carefully with this in mind.

In the ancient text, Ajātaśatru begins by asking his question concerning a possible visit to the religious leaders. Although he is surrounded by people anxious to do his bidding and is favoured with a beautiful night, he is unsatisfied. Outwardly a king, inwardly he is in dire need. He knows that his needs can be met only by one of the teachers, who are specialists in the internal realm. The comments made earlier about the theme of peace need not be repeated here but they are obviously relevant. Peace in the deep sense is assumed in Buddhist literature of this time to be the fruit of self mastery, and hence what is symbolic of peace (such as silence) is secondarily symbolic of self mastery.

When the king sets out to visit the Buddha he does so with great majesty. His five hundred elephants are, no doubt, a show of military strength. That these are cow elephants ridden by the king's women, led by the king mounted on a bull elephant, indicates that this is also a symbol of the manliness (vīrya) of the king. The torches (perhaps not really necessary if the night is so brightly moonlit) aptly complete the picture, being indicative of the king's majesty and glory (tejas). Yet despite this display of external power Ajātaśatru is suddenly overcome with fear and suspicion. Thus is the contrast between outer might and inner weakness made. As has been commented above, the king's turmoil is caused by the stillness (that is, peace) of the Assembly. It can now be seen that this fits with the scheme found in the Khantivādi Jātaka. Kalābu's jealousy and rage and Ajātaśatru's fear and suspicion are alike the result of an inability to believe in, and conceive of, internal mastery.

The implications of Buddhaghosa's statement that "the Lord loves little noise" whereas "kings take delight in noise",[100] are perhaps now evident. This is the contrast between the śramaṇa and the king expressed in terms of silence and noise. To be faced with silence is to be forced to look inward. For kings (particularly those of the moral caliber of Kalābu and Ajātaśatru) to look inward is to be faced with the horrible degradation and disarray of one's self. This leads to panic. In addition to the present passage, this is also suggested by Buddhaghosa's story of the king's great fear of falling asleep, for to fall asleep is to become subject to the powerful forces within one that one has repressed and avoided in waking consciousness.

When the king meets the Buddha he is at once deeply impressed by the calm of the Assembly. Perhaps his amazement results in part from an unconscious comparison between the order of the Buddha's "retinue", which springs from self control, and the comparative disorder of the retinue to which he is accustomed, which is controlled by fear of external force. This may seem far-fetched, but the following passage from the Dhammacetiya Sutta portrays Prasenajit, the powerful king of Kosala, as making remarks to this effect:

> And again, revered sir, I, a noble anointed king, am able to execute one deserving of execution, to fine one deserving to be fined, to banish one deserving banishment. But when I am sitting on a case, people sometimes speak interrupting (me). And I get no chance to say: 'While I am sitting on the case do not, good sirs, speak interrupting (me). Let the good sirs wait until I have finished speaking.' But I, revered sir, see monks here at a time when the Lord is teaching dhamma to various assemblies, and at that time there is no sound of expectorating

---

[100]Above, p. 243.

> among the Lord's disciples, no sound of coughing. Once upon a time, revered sir, when the Lord was teaching dhamma to various assemblies a certain disciple of the Lord coughed; one of his fellow Brahma-farers tapped his knee and said: 'Let the venerable one make no noise; the Lord, our Teacher, is teaching dhamma.' In connection with this it occurred to me, revered sir: 'Indeed, it is wonderful, indeed it is marvelous; assuredly, how well trained--without stick, without sword --must be such an assembly.' And outside this, revered sir, I see no assembly well trained thus.[101]

Although Ajātaśatru remarks on the calm of the Assembly and sees in this calm that for which he longs, it seems that he does not fully grasp its significance. When he was approaching the grove he did not understand the silence of the Assembly; now that he is in the grove he does not understand its tranquillity. As remarked earlier, there are two levels of peace at issue in the text. The king apparently sees only the lower. He does not comprehend the difference between the tranquillity that signifies freedom from guilt and fear and the tranquillity that signifies freedom from conditioned existence. His question to the Buddha is indicative of this lack of insight. He asks if the Buddha can show him present and visible fruit of the life of the śramaṇa. But is not this fruit precisely the self control and tranquillity which is presently visible to him in the Assembly of monks? Is it not fair to say that if he really perceived the inner realm and what it implies he would not have asked his question?

So what is present to the king, what is before his eyes, is not visible to him. The purpose of the Buddha's discourse is hence

---

[101] I. B. Horner's translation, Middle, II, 304-305. MN II, 121-122 (T.26: vol, 1, p. 797a, 12-24).

to bring about this kind of vision in him, to lead him from the external realm to the internal. In reply to the question, therefore, the Buddha begins by getting Ajātaśatru to acknowledge the fruits of the _śramaṇa_'s life that are most external: increased social status, respect and material support from the king, and so on. The king can see and understand this sort of advantage. Gradually the Buddha begins to introduce the practices that genuinely set the _śramaṇa_ apart from other people. At the beginning these are such rules of common morality as can be grasped by one at the king's level, but eventually the Buddha introduces the finer points of self cultivation, which culminate in the attainment of the higher goal. The long document dealing with the training of the _śramaṇa_, which is not peculiar to the _Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra_, is a classic description of the journey from the external to the internal. It begins with the abandoning of home out of faith in the Buddha, and culminates in the destruction of rebirth. Having started by cutting the social ties that bind, one ends by cutting off the most intimate and internal of bonds, the _āsravas_, and reaching complete Freedom. This final attainment is said in the present text to be an immediate and visible fruit of the _śramaṇa_'s life, but it was not visible to the king at the beginning of the discourse. If it is visible to him now, it is because he has made the journey inward.

Of course we have to face the problem that in the ancient text the teaching event is not seen as having been entirely successful. The king has not attained the insight into transitoriness, and he has attained only the lower level of peace and not the higher. His failure

to attain the dharmacakṣu is connected directly to his patricide, but his failure to reach the tranquillity characteristic of the monk is the result of the vast distance between the king and the śramaṇa. As long as he remains a king this peace is beyond his grasp, for "if a king delights in quietude, his kingdom collapses; if his mind turns to his kingdom, his quietude is ruined."[102]

In itself, the long document describing the self cultivation of the śramaṇa is an optimistic work, for it shows the possibility and the means of crossing the barrier from the external to the internal realm. But to listen to this discourse, to hear about someone crossing the barrier, is not the same as having oneself crossed it. The point of the Buddha's giving this extended sermon, in this sutra and elsewhere, seems to be to indicate the direction one must turn, namely inward, if freedom is to be won. In the present case, the attempt is made simply to bring Ajātaśatru to some degree of realization of the futility of turning outward to sense gratification and dominance. But if he should decide to aim at final peace he will have to give up his kingship. The following passage from the Māgandiya Sutta seems appropriate here:

> 'Māgandiya, it is like a leper, a man with his limbs all ravaged and festering, and who, being eaten by vermin, tearing his open sores with his nails, scorches his body over a charcoal pit. But the more, Māgandiya, this leper, a man with his limbs...scorches his body over a charcoal pit, the more those open sores of his become septic and evil-smelling and putrefying and there is only a sorry relief and satisfaction to be had from scratching the open sores. Even so, Māgandiya, do beings who are not yet devoid of attachment to

---

[102]Above, p. 246.

sense-pleasures, while being consumed by the craving for sense-pleasures and burning with the fever for sense-pleasures, pursue sense-pleasures; and the more these beings who are not yet devoid of attachment to sense-pleasures...pursue them, the more their craving for sense-pleasures increases, the more they burn with the fever for sense-pleasures, and moreover there is only a sorry relief and satisfaction to be had from the five strands of sense-pleasures.

What do you think about his, Māgandiya? Have you ever seen or heard of a king or a king's chief minister who, endowed and provided with the five strands of sense-pleasure--revelling in them--and who had neither got rid of the craving for sense-pleasure nor suppressed the fever for sense-pleasures, dwelt or is dwelling or will dwell devoid of thirst, his mind inwardly calmed?'

'No, good Gotama.'

'It is good, Māgandiya. Neither have I seen or heard of this, that a king or a king's chief minister...his mind inwardly calmed. But, Magandiya, whatever recluses and brahmans, dwelt or are dwelling or will dwell, devoid of thirst, with a mind inwardly calmed, all these, having known the coming to be and passing away of these same sense-pleasures, their satisfaction and peril and the escape as it really is, on getting rid of the craving for sense-pleasures, suppressing the fever for sense-pleasures, dwelt or are dwelling or will dwell devoid of thirst, with a mind inwardly calmed [ajjhattaṃ vūpasantacittā].[103]

The extant versions of the sutra retain this theme, and in some cases amplify it significantly. P makes the least changes, being content to make more explicit the stages whereby the Buddha attempts to take the king from the external to the internal realm.[104] In the remaining versions, the longer introductory section presents the king

---

[103] I. B. Horner's translation, Middle, II, 187. MN I, 507-508. (T.26: vol. 1, p. 671c)

[104] Above, pp. 175ff.

with a choice between external and internal things (hitherto referred to as a choice between the secular and the religious). He can take himself to sense pleasure and conquest or he can approach the religious leaders. In M, C1 and C3 this choice is presented to him in response to his question "what shall I do?" and, as argued earlier, the ensuing text thus comes to provide a conversion archetype. This point can now be refined by adding that this conversion experience is pictured as a carefully graded process of turning from outwardness to inwardness.

Several versions portray in a way not found in the ancient text the king's abandonment of the external realm and entry into the internal realm as he approaches the Buddha. The divestiture of the royal insignia, mentioned in two texts,[105] is one means of symbolizing this. Further, symbols are not lacking that point to the Buddha as a king.[106] He is, that is to say, king (master) of the internal sphere. It is particularly important in this connection to note that several versions describe the radiance of the Buddha and his assembly.[107] Symbolically, this can be seen as the counterpart of the blaze of the king's torches. The king has come with a display of external tejas, and the Buddha responds with tejas generated from within, the fruit of self cultivation. C3 pointedly has Ajātaśatru unable to understand this light, and it is necessary for Jīvaka to explain its inward origin:

---

[105]Above, pp. 141-143.

[106]Above, pp. 140ff.

[107]Above, p. 143.

> [Ajātaśatru:] 'But what is the cause of this light?'
>
> [Jīvaka:] 'It simply due to the power of samādhi that this light has come forth.'[108]

The Sumaṅgalavilāsinī contains a considerable amount of material relevant to the present theme, but most of it has been dealt with already. It may be sufficient here to look at a passage that serves to corroborate the interpretation just given of the Buddha's radiance. Dealing with the section of the text where Ajātaśatru has just descended from his mount and is about to enter the pavilion, Buddhaghosa comments:

> As soon as his feet touched the ground the glory (tejo) of the Lord pervaded the king's body. The sweat broke out all over him to the point where he felt he should have to remove his outer garments, they oppressed him so. And, remembering his transgression, he was filled with great fear.[109]

While none of this is hinted at in P, Buddhaghosa is in agreement with other traditions on the glory of the Buddha and on its significance. There is no doubt of the superiority of the Buddha's tejas, for when the king is hit by a wave of it his body feels the heat and his mind is cast into fear and confusion.

This may suffice to give some idea of the importance of this theme to our sutra. Just as the use of the theme in the Buddha-legend derives a good deal of its power from the fact that it is historically

---

[108] Above, p. 80.

[109] Bhūmiyaṃ patiṭṭhita-sama-kālam eva pana Bhagavato tejo rañño sarīram phari. Ath'assa tāvad eva sakala-sarīrato seda muccimsu, sāṭakā pīletvā apanetabbā viya ahesuṃ. Attano aparādhaṃ sari, mahā-bhayam uppajji. Sumaṅgala., 151.

grounded (that is, the Buddha was in fact raised in a royal family of considerable wealth and influence, which he abandoned when he went forth to become a śramaṇa), so also its use in the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra derives power from the historical base. We know that Ajātaśatru was one of the most outstanding imperialists, one of the most ardent and successful graspers of power, in India at this time, and his kingdom became the basis for later and more extensive empires. And the Buddha was indeed the Great Śramaṇa who laid the groundwork for a vast "kingdom" that was to extend throughout Asia, a kingdom rooted in internal mastery.

The Buddha's Skill as a Teacher

The Buddha is portrayed in the early canon as having an almost uncanny ability to teach--to take people of any spiritual level and bring them to a perception of what is important and true. We are told that this ability earned him the reputation of having special magic whereby he converted people to his dharma regardless of their previous beliefs and sectarian affiliation. One of the most colorful episodes in this connection is that found in the Upāli Sutta, where the Buddha converts a staunch lay supporter of the Jains, Upāli, to the dismay of Nirgrantha Jñātiputra (Mahāvīra). A selection of passages from this sutra may serve to introduce the present theme.

Upāli the householder, having come to the idea that he is able to refute the Buddha in argument, boasts to Nirgrantha Jñātiputra and Dīrghatapasvin (a venerable Jain ascetic):

And even as a full-grown elephant, sixty years old, having plunged into a deep tank, plays at the game called the 'merry washing', even so methinks will I play the game of 'merry washing' with the recluse Gotama. But, if you please, I am going, revered sir, I will refute the words of the recluse Gotama on this point of controversy.[110]

Nirgrantha Jñātiputra replies:

'Go you, householder, refute the words of the recluse Gotama on this point of controversy. For, householder, either I or Dīghatapassin the Jain or you could refute the words of the recluse Gotama.'[111]

The text continues:

When this had been said, Dīghatapassin the Jain spoke thus to Nātaputta the Jain: 'I am not pleased, revered sir, that the householder Upāli should refute the words of the recluse Gotama. For the recluse Gotama is deceitful, revered sir, he knows the "enticing device" by which he entices disciples of other sects.' [Samaṇo hi, Bhante, Gotamo māyāvī āvaṭṭaniṃ māyaṃ jānāti yāya aññatitthiyānaṃ sāvake āvaṭṭeti.]

'It is impossible, Tapassin, it cannot come to pass that the householder Upāli should come to discipleship under the recluse Gotama. But this situation exists --that the recluse Gotama might come to discipleship under the householder Upāli. Go you, householder, refute the words of the recluse Gotama on this point of controversy.'[112]

But of course the Buddha has no trouble conquering Upāli in debate. Upāli takes refuge and becomes a Buddhist lay supporter. Nirgrantha Jñātiputra

---

[110] I. B. Horner's translation, Middle, II. 39. MN I, 375. The Chinese Madhyama Āgama version of the sutra is found at T.26: vol. 1, pp. 628ff.

[111] Middle, II, 39-40.

[112] Middle, II, 40. MN I, 375.

is shocked at the news of this conversion and goes to have words with Upāli. His angry rebuke and the layman's reply are classic:

> You, householder, are out of your mind; you householder, are idiotic. Saying: 'I, revered sir, will refute the recluse Gotama', and having gone (to him), you have returned enmeshed in a great verbal tangle. Householder, as a man, a gelder, having gone away, might return with removed testicles, or as a man,a gouger, having gone away, might return with removed eyeballs, even so did you, householder, saying: 'I revered sir, will refute the recluse Gotama', having gone (to him), return enmeshed in a great verbal tangle. You, householder, were enticed by the 'enticing device' of the recluse Gotama.
>
> Auspicious, revered sir, is this 'enticing device', lovely, revered sir, is this 'enticing device.' If, revered sir, my dear kith and kin could be enticed by this 'enticing', for long it would be for the welfare and happiness of my dear kith and kin...And, revered sir, if the world, with its *devas*, its Māras, its Brahmās, creation with its recluses and brahmans, its *devas* and men, could be enticed by this 'enticing', for long it would be for the welfare and happiness of this world with its *devas*, its Māras, its Brahmās, of creation with its recluses and brahmans, its *devas* and man.[113]

So the Buddha was accused of knowing an enticing device (or, knowing conversion magic: *āvaṭṭaniṃ māyaṃ jānāti*). Whether he knew such or not, there is no doubt but that he must have been a highly skilled teacher. As to the precise nature of this skill and its employment in discourse, there is plenty of opportunity to observe it in the literature, the lengthly dialogues of the *Dīrgha* and *Madyama Āgamas* being the most revealing in this respect. In a justly famous passage from his "Introduction to the *Kassapasīhanāda Sutta*", T. W. Rhys Davids describes the Buddha's teaching method as seen in these works as follows:

---

[113] *Middle*, II, 48-49.

> When speaking on sacrifice to a sacrificial priest, on union with God to an adherent of the current theology, on Brahman claims to superior social rank to a proud Brahman, on mystic insight to a man who trusts in it, on the soul to one who believes in the soul theory, the method followed is always the same. Gotama puts himself as far as possible in the mental position of the questioner. He attacks none of his cherished convictions. He accepts as the starting-point of his own exposition the desirability of the act or condition prized by his opponent--of the union with God (as in the Tevijja), or of sacrifice (as in the Kūṭadanta), or of social rank (as in the Ambaṭṭha), or of seeing heavenly sights, &c. (as in the Mahāli), or of the soul theory (as in the Poṭṭhapāda). He even adopts the very phraseology of his questioner. And then, partly by putting a new and (from the Buddhist point of view) a higher meaning into the words; partly by an appeal to such ethical conceptions as are common ground between them; he gradually leads his opponent up to his conclusion. This is, of course, always Arhatship--that is the sweetest fruit of the life of a recluse, that is the best sacrifice, that the highest social rank, that the best means of seeing heavenly sights, and a more worthy object; and so on.[114]

This method of teaching becomes known as "skill in means" (upāya kauśalya) in Mahāyāna Buddhism, where it assumes a position of great doctrinal importance. While this particular term is not common in the canon of Small Vehicle Buddhism, the essentials of the doctrine are found there. Briefly, the teaching process is conceived of thus. The teacher (usually the Buddha) begins by assessing the pupil's mind: its bent, its inclinations and proclivities. This assessment or perception may take place either normally or paranormally. He then adjusts the subject and level of his discourse to fit the hearer's mind. When the two minds--that of the pupil and that of the teacher--are engaged, the discourse is given, the hearer being involved directly in the

---

[114] Dialogues, I, 206.

teaching process by the method of question and answer. Then, as Rhys Davids says, the teacher "gradually leads his opponent up to his conclusion." This involves a purifying and calming of the hearer's mind, an uplifiting of his desires and inclinations such that he is eventually brought to perceive for himself, to verify through his own insight, the truths that the teacher wishes to convey and which he was initially ill-suited to comprehend.

In this scheme, the initial bent of the pupil's mind remains a limiting factor. The teacher may change it in the course of his teaching, but his power of transformation (even if the teacher is the Buddha) is not unlimited. The hearer's mind is not entirely intractable but neither is it infinitely flexible. There are, therefore, bounds within which the Buddha's teaching is effective, bounds within which his saving power is operative. such restrictions are generally accepted and acknowledged in the ancient canon.

There are various ways of describing the direction of movement involved in the process of teaching and guiding the pupil. One may say with Rhys Davids, for example, that the teacher "leads his opponent up"; that is, one may use the image of uplifting and exalting. But just as validly one may speak of the movement as from the external to the internal, from the enthrallment with what the five senses perceive to examination of the depths of the mind and heart. It is this way of describing the situation that has been chosen in the present chapter.

It is not difficult to see that this teaching scheme is used in the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra, To begin with, the Buddha assesses the king--his spiritual level and mental state. He hears the king's prayer

for his son's peace (and for his own peace), and he sees his awe and respect for the serenity of the Assembly. When the king asks his question the Buddha immediately perceives that it is a test question. It is not coming from a mind of faith but from a mind of distrust. Next, the Buddha asks for an account of the king's encounters with these teachers. It is odd that he should ask this, for he certainly already knows the doctrines of the six heretics and is not looking to learn anything new about them. Evidently, then, it is the king about whom the Buddha wants to learn. He is able to hear the king's own account of the encounters and, most importantly, to hear his reaction to the speeches of the teachers. When Ajātaśatru finally finishes his recounting of the visits and puts his question anew to the Buddha, the latter has had time to assess him and determine the best method of approach. The most obvious thing he has no doubt learned is that the king is only interested in hearing about what is concrete and visible, and that he rejects out of hand all answers that involve subtle discussion of hidden facts of reality. This is, of course, what anyone familiar with Ajātaśatru's exploits would have expected. His thirst for conquest and his usurpation of the throne out of impatience are expressive of his own determination to gain concrete reward and to do so without delay. In addition, however, it is possible that the Buddha sees him as a man in desperation, who is not really interested in the fruits of a śramaṇa's life but in the corrosive and degrading effects of his own evil actions. Thus informed, the Buddha begins to teach. He immediately involves the king in the process by putting a question to him. He suggests a case with which the king is familiar: "Suppose

among the people of your household there were a slave."[115] Thus is the subject of the discourse fit to the hearer. Further, however, and more subtly, the king's values are at this point accepted. (As Rhys Davids says: "He accepts as the starting-point of his own exposition the desirability of the act or condition prized by his opponent".) The slave in the king's service is the precise opposite of a king: he has no respect paid him, no account taken of him. He moves for others, no one moves for him; he bows to others, no one bows to him. Yet the Buddha shows how this man, by becoming a <u>śramaṇa</u>, is able to arrive at the extraordinary state where a king (indeed Ajātaśatru himself) would offer him material support and rise from his seat to pay him reverence. Furthermore, while the Buddha does not claim that the slave gains external power by becoming a <u>śramaṇa</u>, he does show how he is able to escape the power of the king, however great this power may seem. Ajātaśatru admits that he would not force this man back into his service. All of these attainments are thus of the sort that the king can understand and acknowledge. After giving the further example of the householder who goes forth from home, which adds little beyond showing that the fruits of the <u>śramaṇa</u>'s life as already detailed are universally applicable, the Buddha gives the long graded discourse that ends with the description of the attainment of complete liberation. As explained above, this discourse is not unique to our sutra, but it is nevertheless a very careful account of the journey from the external to the internal.

---

[115] Rhys Davids' translation, <u>Dialogues</u>, I, 76. <u>Taṃ kiṃ maññasi, Mahārāja, idha te assa puriso dāso....</u> DN I, 60.

The question arises as to how well this document is suited to the Śrāmanyaphala Sūtra. As far as the ancient text is concerned, the document is generally harmonious with the rest of the sutra but disharmonious in certain specific respects. It is generally harmonious in that it proceeds by stages, from the lower to the higher (or the external to the internal) in keeping with the Buddha's teaching method elsewhere in the text and in keeping with the king's spiritual state. What is discordant is this: Ajātaśatru has not won significant insight through the discourse, which is to say that he has not stayed with the Buddha on the journey inward. In view of his extremely low moral condition it is peculiar that the Buddha should give a discourse of such length and concerned with such subtle and exalted attainments. Would it not have made more sense to restrict the discourse to the early section of this document dealing with fundamental matters of morality? All of this simply gives weight to the suggestion made earlier that whatever the original home of this long document may be, there is no reason to think it is the Śrāmanyaphala Sūtra.

This is not to say that the failure of the Buddha to bring his pupil to insight is incomprehensible or unprecedented. It is neither. It is simply a case of the king's heart and mind not being sufficiently malleable to allow him to be brought to insight on this occasion. It is an example of the restriction on the Buddha's saving power, recognized as such in the ancient canon. More specifically, the king's darkness of mind is the result of his evil actions in the past, and the Buddha can neither eradicate those actions nor prevent their effects.

Obviously one of the main points to be made in connection with the Buddha's skill in teaching is the contrast between the way the Buddha and the other religious leaders respond to the king. We have seen the efforts the Buddha is willing to make to adapt his discourse to Ajātaśatru; the heretical teachers, on the other hand, are reported as having simply given their distinctive doctrines without regard for the questioner and his specific problems and without any attempt to involve him in working throughthe issue. One might say that they preach to him rather than teaching him. Whether or not there is any historical basis for this contrast--whether or not the Buddha had a genuinely different method of approach from the other religious leaders of the time--we do not know, but Buddhist scripture certainly insists on this.

There are few changes in the depiction of the Buddha's teaching skill seen in the extant versions of the text, but such changes as are found are important. The most significant is that of making the discourse successful. This process is witnessed in several texts[116] and reaches an extreme in C2. By itself this may seem a trivial change--the Buddha succeeds as usual instead of failing--but if considered as part of a general tendency it is apparent that it actually destroys the teaching scheme found in the ancient canon. If the mind of the hearer does not figure as a limiting factor in the teaching process, if, in short, the teacher's power is unlimited, there isno teaching process at all, but an inevitable saving event. There is simply the inexorable enlightening power of the teacher (the Buddha) exerted

---

[116] Above, pp. 184ff.

upon infinitely malleable (and hence essentially characterless) sentient beings. The "divinization" of the Buddha is seen in operation.

Beyond this, the chief change is that found in C3, where the teaching (or saving) skill is given explicit recognition. When the king has heard the recommendations of the heretical teachers he considers to himself: "But these men [here recommended] are dense and deluded: they cannot distinguish the true from the false and are without skillful expedients.[117] The term translated as "skillful expedients" is 巧便 in Chinese, and probably reflects a reading of upāya or upāya kauśalya in the Indian text. The king, then, knows from previous experience with the heretical teachers that they lack this ability, and he knows that without it they are of no help to him. Later, when the Buddha is giving his discourse to the king, he concludes each demonstration by saying that by this expedient the king may know that there is present and visible recompense for meritorious action.[118] The word "expedient" translates Chinese 方便, which probably stands for the term upāya in the original. So the Buddha is seen as exercising his teaching ability through the use of devices or expedients, upāya, which assist in the bringing of great benefit to the king. Finally, at the conclusion of the sutra the Buddha says: "Hence, bhikṣus, when it is a case of a man who has committed sin one must serach for an expedient in order to bring about this faith without roots."[119] Success in troublesome cases

---

[117] Above, p. 75.

[118] Above, p. 84ff.

[119] Above, p. 89.

such as that of Ajātaśatru depends upon the teacher's possession of skill in means. We remember also that the very reason for the insertion of the sutra (C3) at this juncture in the Ekottara Āgama was its display of the skill of the Buddha that sets him apart from other teachers. He is like the wise cowherd who knows how to bring his cattle safely across the river, while the foolish cowherd (the heretical teacher) lets them drown.[120]

The point made here is not peculiar to C3. What is unique to this version is that this teaching skill of the Buddha is made explicit, is given a name. It is in Mahāyāna texts that "skill in means" comes to the foreground as a formal doctrine, and C3's use of the term is probably to be explained by the affiliation of the Chinese Ekottara with Mahāyāna.

Action and Recompense

The text shows a concern with action and recompense on two levels. First, the king's test question is directly related to the problem of the fruits of action. This is so even though it is a specific type of action and a specific type of recompense at issue. Second, the king is concerned at a deeper level with his own actions in the past and with their evil consequences. His interest in action and recompense is grounded in his personal agony.

The heretical teachers fail to satisfy Ajātaśatru at either of these levels. With regard to their response to his question, one author has commented:

---

[120] Above, pp. 109-110.

> The question was simple enough. The teachers must have understood it. Evidently, there was no real answer from their points of view: none of them could think of any real advantage in the life of a recluse.[121]

This point is so basic one might almost miss it. But it is very important. According to the doctrines of all the heretical teachers except Mahāvīra, who clearly does not fit in this group, there was no benefit to be gained by abandoning home and becoming a *śramaṇa*, and no point to the *śramaṇa*'s exertion. By contrast, in the Buddha's system there was positive value and reward to these things, as is amply shown in his discourse. On the more personal level, Ajātaśatru has come to the teachers oppressed by the consciousness of the evil nature of his previous deeds and certain that he will have to suffer (and is indeed already suffering) for them. Yet the teachers, again excepting Mahāvīra, are unable to affirm that morally good and bad actions have any significance or any effect. Pūraṇa Kāśyapa says that there is no sin and demerit involved in killing.[122] Maskarin Gośālīputra tells the king that there is no cause for the moral purity and impurity of beings. Ajita Keśakambalin says that there is fruit of neither good nor bad deeds, and Kakuda Kātyāyana explains that according to his doctrine there is no such thing as one who kills. Sañjayin Vairaṭīputra declines to

---

[121] D. Chattopadhyaya, *Lokāyata: A Study in Ancient Indian Materialism* (3rd ed.; New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1973), p. 509. See also p. 486 of the same work.

[122] For this and the following remarks, see above, pp. 152-163.

give a definite answer. Surely Ajātaśatru's dissatisfaction with the replies of the heretics stems in large part from the fact that these doctrines fail to take his guilt and dread seriously. They exclude the possibility of meaningful confession, repentance, and moral regeneration. The Buddha's discourse, on the other hand, leaves no doubt about the power of morality. And when the king does confess, the Buddha tells him honestly that he has been foolish and deluded, and that it is important for him to recognize his evil deeds as evil and try to improve in the future. One of the main points of the sutra, therefore, is that materialism, nihilism, fatalism and extreme scepticism do not do justice to the subjective certainty of moral pollution and wrong.

This being the case, the king's question is a test question in a rather deeper sense than suggested previously. It not only reveals the general worth of the religious teacher, but in addition elicits his viewpoint on moral action and recompense. Hence it does have a substantive relationship to Ajātaśatru's spiritual state, to the theme of conversion, and to the sutra as a whole.

Similarly, it should be clear that through the theme of action and recompense the Six Heretics section is bound securely to the rest of the text. Although the king may be justified in saying that the teachers have not directly answered his question, their discourses are certainly not unrelated to it. Essentially, they are "philosophical" answers to a non-philosophical question. The religious leaders feel that the question invites analysis, and they proceed to deal with the general problem of which it presents a specific case. They brush aside the details of Ajātaśatru's concern and tackle "action and

recompense". They have not failed utterly to answer him, therefore, but have merely answered on a different level. Because of this they have failed to reach him, and it is only the Buddha, who takes care to respond on his level, who wins his acceptance.

At the same time it is probably unwise to go further and claim detailed connections between the speeches of the heretics and their context in the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra. If they were unique to this text such a procedure might be justified. The repeated references to the fact that killing is not evil, for example, might be taken as obsequious attempts to gain the king's favour by pardoning his crime. Pūraṇa Kāśyapa's description of a man making "all the living creatures on the earth one heap, one mass, of flesh"[123] with a weapon seems to point most naturally to a king, as does his reference to a man going "along the south bank of the Ganges striking and slaying, mutiliating and having men mutilated, oppressing and having men oppressed".[124] Such statements could easily be seen as part of an ideology designed to justify ruthless imperialism of just the sort that Ajātaśatru was engaged in. We might even take Ajita Keśakambalin's pronouncement that "there is neither father nor mother"[125] as a further allusion to Ajātaśatru's patricide (and an attempt to absolve him from it). The problem with such interpretations, however, is that they ignore the fact that these speeches are found,

---

[123] Dialogues, I, 70; DN I, 52.

[124] Ibid.

[125] Dialogues, I, 73; DN I, 55.

in identical or similar forms, outside of our sutra, some even being found outside of Buddhist literature. Although the problem of the original source of these statements has not been taken up in this thesis, it seems highly unlikely that the Śrāmanyaphala is that source. Until this issue is studied carefully it would be incautious to say more about the precise relation of the Six Heretics section to its present context.

It will be noticed that Nirgrantha Jñātiputra (Mahāvīra) does not seem to belong with the other five heretical teachers. This uniqueness of the Jains relative to the other sects with which the early Buddhists competed is confirmed by a study of the Buddhist canon. While it is true that the Jains (known to the Buddhists as the Nirgranthas) are often criticized, the issues on which they disagree with the Buddhists are not nearly as serious as those at stake where the other sects are concerned. In fact, the acrimoniousness of the debates between the Buddhists and the Jains may stem precisely from their agreement in fundamental matters, for they seem to have been competing for the same "ecological niche" in the religious environment of the time.

Now the most common area of dispute between the two groups as seen in Buddhist literature is precisely that of moral action and its effects.[126] Neither group denies the importance of moral action or the gravity of its effects (in contrast to the other five teachers

---

[126] See the Cūḷadukkhakkhandha Sutta, MN I, 91ff. (T.26: vol. 1, pp. 586ff; T.54: vol. 1, pp. 848f.; T.55: vol. 1, pp. 849ff.; T.125: vol. 2, p. 744); the Upāli Sutta, MN I, 371 ff. (T.26: vol. 1, pp. 628ff.); and the Devadaha Sutta, MN II, 214ff. (T.26: vol. 1, pp. 442ff.).

that make an appearance in our text); the main quarrel, rather, is whether it is action of body or of mind that has greater potency and requires more attention. The Jains are pictured as putting more stress on action of the body, whereas the Buddhists stress action of the mind. In line with this, the former are shown as excessively concerned with mortification of the body, which the Buddhists consider useless to the attainment of what is of genuine importance, namely inner (mental) control and purity. For their part, the Jains, as seen both in Buddhist literature and in their own scriptures,[127] accuse their opponents of duplicity, claiming that they use their doctrine of the importance of the inner state to excuse immoral action.

But such disputes hardly seem relevant to the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra. The Jains certainly recognized the efficacy of the monk's striving--indeed, the Buddhists regarded them as altogether too ascetic--so that to the king's question Mahāvīra could certainly have replied that there was fruit to the life of a śramaṇa. Whether or not this fruit could be won in one's present lifetime is a more complicated matter, but I am not convinced that the Jains would have found this more difficult to affirm than the Buddhists. As to Ajātaśatru's moral state, Mahāvīra would have been quite capable of recognizing its poverty and recommending steps to improve it. The confession and repentance would be perfectly meaningful within the Nirgrantha system. The dispute over the relative priority of karmic agents does not bear on the case, for Ajātaśatru was not only depraved mentally but had physically committed evil deeds (such as imprisoning his father and sending assassins against the Buddha).

[127] See the Sīha Sutta, AN IV, 179ff. and the Jain Sūtrakṛtāṅga, Jacobi, trans., Jaina Sūtras, Part II, pp. 414-415.

The inappropriateness of Nirgrantha Jñātiputra in the sutra is further indicated by the uncertainty of the transmitters of the text as to how to handle him. He is credited with four different doctrines, and of the three that are plausible two are not entirely appropriate from the literary point of view. That is to say, in P and C2-M, he comes very close to answering the king's question, which he is not supposed to do. In the end, one has to conclude that he is out of place in the text and was presumably included simply because he represented a major sect of which the Buddhists were critical and with which they competed.

The most significant alterations in the theme of action and recompense occur in C3, the version from the Chinese Ekottara. Here the question the king asks is much broader than in the ancient text. He asks: Does one who in this present existence makes merit (i.e. does good deeds) win recompense, here and now? Does this broadening of the issue indicate that C3 is more concerned than the ancient text with the general philosophical question of action and recompense? I think it extremely doubtful. It is likely, rather, that the philosophical issue of action and recompense so hotly debated by the wandering ascetical groups of the Buddha's day was less vital in the historical context that shaped C3. There are great changes in the Six Heretics section of the sutra in this version, changes that indicate an ignorance of the ascetical groups themselves and of their types of argument. C3 shows no knowledge of either Ājīvaka or Jain doctrine, as it ascribes inappropriate speeches to both Maskarin Gośālīputra and Nirgrantha Jñātiputra. Many of the most interesting doctrines are either greatly abbreviated

or entirely deleted. This entire section, in fact, which in the ancient text contains much of relevance to the problem of action and recompense, is here reduced to a shadow of its former self and is firmly subordinated to other themes of the sutra. Of these themes it is the conversion theme that is most obviously rising to greater prominence, so it is quite possible that it is this that has caused the changes in the king's question. To be sure, the alteration of the question to more directly reflect the king's spiritual state is not as flagrant as in C2. But after the confession Ajātaśatru is made to say: "I pray that the World Honoured One dispel my guilt and increase my good dharmas, [that I may attain to] everlasting peace. For I know that what I have done has incurred only evil recompense, and has produced no good roots."[128] This is an expression of his desire to escape the bad effects of his past action and begin at once to accumulate merit. The Buddha then tells him that there are two types of person born instantly in the heavens at the time of death: he who has created no "bad roots", and he who has produced bad roots but who has managed in this lifetime to set himself right.[129] Ajātaśatru aspires to be among the latter group. Finally, the Buddha assures him that if he governs righteously he will gain long life (in the present existence).[130] In short, then, the king's fears and needs are more directly expressed in the new formulation of the question than they were in the formulation found in the ancient text.

---

[128]Above, p. 87.

[129]Above, pp. 87-88.

[130]Above, p. 88.

A second reason for the great change in the question in C3 is the tendency toward universalization. In its altered form the question is of interest and relevance to everyone, not merely to the *śramana*, and the sutra is thus enabled to speak to a wider audience. It will be noticed that the *śramaṇa* has been very nearly removed from this version. The probable causes of this are the lateness of this text in its present form (as compared with the ancient text), and its Mahāyāna affiliations. By the fifth century A.D. the fires of the original *śramaṇa* movement had burnt low, and this is evident especially in C2 and C3 which, with their many corruptions and deletions, reflect the burning issues of the earlier text but dimly. And while Mahāyāna did not by any means reject monkhood, it is undeniable that it gave a higher status to the layman than did the Buddhism of the Small Vehicle. The state of the layman was exalted by being admitted as a valid condition of life for the *bodhisattva*. And it was the *bodhisattva* that concerned this movement, not the *śramaṇa*. To be a *śramaṇa*, even a Buddhist *śramaṇa* of spotless moral conduct and great insight, was not necessarily to be on the correct path: one could still be a poor *śrāvaka* who had not yet lifted his eyes to the higher goal of Buddhahood.

One may ask how, even granting these changes in religious climate, the textual tradition could simply eliminate all reference to the *śramaṇa* from the king's question. One possibility may be suggested. The Prakrit *sāmañña*, besides being the equivalent of Sanskrit *śrāmaṇya*, represents Sanskrit *sāmānya* ("general, universal"). The phrase "*diṭṭheva dhamme*

sanditthikaṃ sāmaññaphalaṃ"[131] ("the present and visible fruit of the śramaṇa's life pertaining to this very existence") could therefore be read as "the present and visible general fruit [of action] pertaining to this very existence."[132] In this way the reference to the śramaṇa may be neatly excised from the text. This explanation is speculative, but is worthy of consideration.

The Fruits of the Life of a Śramaṇa (B)

The various fruits of the śramaṇa's life, such as peace and internal mastery, are, as already shown, suggested in numerous ways in the sutra. Here we are concerned only with the explicit discourse of the Buddha.

The discourse, given in reply to Ajātaśatru's question, has two parts. The first, unique to this sutra and tailored to the king's situation, involves the slave and the farmer who go forth from home to the homeless life. It has been amply discussed. The second is a detailed account of the self-training of the śramaṇa. A number of comments have been made above with regard to this "long document" and its relation to the text as a whole.[133] Although it is not unique to

---

[131] This is the Pali form of the expression. See, for example, DN I, 51.

[132] It is this reading of sāmañña that led Burnouf to translate the passage as : "seigneur, est-il donc possible qu'on leur annonce, dès ce monde-ci, un tel résultat comme prévu et comme le fruit général de leur conduite?" (Grimblot, ed., Sept suttas pālis, p. 194. See Rhys Davids' comments, Dialogues, I, 69, n. 1.) Burnouf was wrong, of course, but his mistake is suggestive.

[133] Above, pp. 4-5, 178ff., 254-255, 265-266.

this sutra, and although the decision has been made not to examine it in depth in this thesis, a summary of its contents seems called for. The following list, therefore, shows the major and minor parts of the document. Note that while the arrangement of the Pali text has been followed here for convenience, all of the following elements are attested in the two other relevant versions of the document (that occurring in C2, and that found in the Chinese Dīrgha).[134] The order of the minor sections and numerous other details differ from version to version, and we must wait for a detailed comparative study utilizing all surviving forms of the work before making statements about its most ancient form.

1. Morality (divided in the Pali version into three sections: Short, Medium and Long)

2. Preliminary ascetical and meditational training

    Restraint of the senses
    Mindfulness
    Contentment

3. Advanced training leading to vision

    Putting aside the mental obstructions
    The four stages of meditation
    The clear seeing of the relation of body and consciousness

4. Fruits of advanced training

    Drawing forth the body that consists of mind
    Enjoyment of this body
    Attainment of clairaudience
    Attainment of the ability to discern the mental states of others

---

[134]The document as found in C2 occurs at T.22: vol. 1, pp. 272c ff., and in the Dīrgha occurs at T.1: vol. 1, pp. 83c ff.

5. Further fruits, which involve the verification of the doctrines of rebirth and karma

Perception of one's former life-states

Clairvoyance: specifically, the ability to perceive the birth and rebirth, rise and fall, of others in accordance with the moral quality of their deeds

6. Attainment of the final goal

Insight into the Four Truths

Insight into the Outflows

Freedom from the Outflows

Knowledge that re-birth has been destroyed and the task accomplished

The above set of attainments is in the texts not merely listed but given in considerable detail with the use of striking similes. Great effort seems to have been spent in making even the most tortuous paths of spiritual training appear attractive to the common man having little experience of them, by appealing to the desire for self-control, peace and joy, purity and freedom, as well as to the longing to perceive and partake of realms of existence normally closed to people. One naturally assumes that the document is therefore intended to attract people from the household to the homeless life, to make monks out of laymen. Curiously, however, in the sutras in which the document occurs the person receiving this discourse seldom goes forth from home. Instead, we find people being brought to the level of Buddhist lay-supporters (upāsakas); they are "converted", in much the same way as Ajātaśatru (though usually more thoroughly). Why a description of the achievements of a monk should be used to attract lay followers I do not know, and can only repeat my earlier suggestion that the purpose of the document is to indicate

to people the general direction in which they must turn if they are desirous of liberation.[135]

Were this document to be dealt with in detail it would be found to contribute further themes to the sutra, the most important being those of purity and freedom. As to the latter, for example, the freedom that the slave initially attains in becoming a śramaṇa is deepened when he escapes the hindrances (nīvaraṇa), and is finally transformed completely from outward to inward freedom in the release from suffering and pollution (duḥkha and the āsravas). Beyond this, the section complements and carries through other major themes of the text, showing with concrete examples the peace and internal mastery attained by the śramaṇa.

It was suggested earlier that the king has presented the Buddha with a dilemma.[136] If the śramaṇa claims to be above concern with the mundane and the material, intent on goals that are not of this world, his begging of concrete support of others seems hypocritical; in addition, one is justified in doubting whether he really attains anything at all through his effort. If he does win concrete and visible results with his toil, he is no different from a common working man and can expect no special consideration or respect. The Buddha's answer is that the śramaṇa wins both sorts of reward, the material and the immaterial. In his description of the former, he convinces the king that the śramaṇa is not simply deluding himself about the efficacy of his activity and

---

[135]Above, p. 255.

[136]Above, pp. 206-207.

he shows how he gains advantages that anyone can see and understand; at the same time he implies that the assiduity of the true <u>śramaṇa</u> justifies his receiving of support from others. In his description of the latter sort of reward, the result of self mastery, the Buddha shows how the monk finally attains the fruit that is supreme and imperishable. This argument progresses slowly from the material to the immaterial and is convincing only the the extent that the hearer (in this case Ajātaśatru) is transformed in the discourse such that he is able to lift his eyes to the higher sphere and increasingly recognize the existence and importance of the inner realm.

Thematic Change

Types of Change

The chief processes observable in our texts that have led to serious thematic change are four: (1) increasing interpretation of the text in light of stories and legends not current when the sutra first came into existence; (2) emphasis on a particular theme in an apparent drive for literary unity, with the consequent subordination of other themes; (3) universalization; (4) divinization. The first three of these have been discussed amply; further comments relative to number (4), however, may be helpful.

In distinguishing the human from the "divine" Buddha I am here interested largely in two different visions of the Buddha found in the literature of Small Vehicle Buddhism, that which emphasizes his *action,*

and that which stresses his presence.[137] According to the first vision the Buddha needed to act to bring himself to the religious goal (to become a "Buddha") and thereafter must act to help and liberate others. According to the second vision action is in neither case necessary: as far as the religious goal is concerned, he is its embodiment from the outset and there is nothing to achieve; as to his relations with other beings, they ask only to be in his holy and transforming presence.[138]

Although both of these visions of the Buddha were, in my opinion, present from earliest times, it cannot be denied that the second became more common as time went on.[139] And it is not surprising, therefore, to see the shift from the first to the second taking place

---

[137] I do not mean to imply that the divine Buddha cannot act, but simply that he does not need to act. The distinction made here is not intended to fully define the divine and human visions but to provide one criterion for separating them.

[138] Both visions of the Buddha's relation to the religious goal are found, for example, in the developed Buddha-legend. On the one hand, much of the story unfolds in an atmosphere of suspense, the outcome being uncertain. In the Bodhisattva's departure from home and throughout his great ascetical efforts, action and striving are crucial. It is only when this great effort has borne fruit in the Enlightenment that the possibility of mankind's liberation is assured. On the other hand, in the birth narratives the Buddha-to-be is shown rising in the world utterly pure, perfect and in full wisdom, such that the liberation of the world may be said to come with the birth itself. Even as according to the former vision the Parinirvāṇa of the Lord is simply the natural culmination of his Enlightenment, so according to the latter vision is the Enlightenment itself but the inevitable fulfillment of the birth event. This description applies, for example, to the Buddhacarita.

[139] Much of the material in the birth narratives, for example, does not belong to the oldest strata of the Buddha-legend. See André Bareau's "La Jeunesse du Buddha dans les Sūtrapiṭaka et les Vinayapiṭaka anciens," Bulletin de L'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient, LXI (1974), 199-274. Note especially pp. 260ff.

in a number of our texts. What is especially interesting in this connection, however, is the means by which this important religious change was accomplished in the texts, and how it came about even in conservative traditions.

In Buddhist studies, a "conservative" scriptural tradition can be defined as one in which pains have been taken to preserve the form and substance of the scripture as handed down from ancient times, the scripture itself being regarded as the "word of the Buddha" (Buddhavacana). Of our texts, all but C3 (and to some extent C2) may be said to belong to such traditions. In this sort of conservative transmission, all types of change are not looked upon with equal disfavour. To delete, for example, is to lose Buddhavacana, upon which liberation depends; addition to the text, on the other hand, has no such obvious effect upon the preservation of the truth. It is not surprising, therefore, that in conservative scriptural traditions texts tend to grow rather than diminish in size.[140] Of all the possible types of addition to take place in such texts, probably the first to come about and altogether the most common is that of the insertion of words and phrases of respect for the Buddha. Especially if one keeps in mind that the transmission

---

[140]Excluding C3, the shortest of the versions of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra is the ancient text, followed by P, which shows some addition of material. The three remaining "conservative" texts (C1, C2, M) are roughly equal in length and are considerably longer than P.

C3, the "innovative" text, is far shorter than any of the preceding due to its omission of the long document dealing with the śramaṇa's attainments. Even if we ignore this omission it is brief, being somewhat longer than P and the ancient text but substantially briefer than the other versions. Examination shows that it attains this brevity not by being cautious in adding new material but by being bold in omitting old material.

was oral in early times, this is a very natural process: the inserted lines of praise are really no more than a "May His name be praised!" pronounced by the transmitter when mentioning the Buddha. In P, for example, the text showing the least change from the time of the ancient text, the two longest added passages are such praise formulae.[141] The same process can be seen in operation in the remaining versions, where it is carried considerably further.

What is important to note is that while the changes in question are characteristically conservative--they are additions rather than deletions and have no doctrinally innovative content--their cumulative effect is to promote the second type of vision of the Buddha, that stressing the sufficiency of his divine presence, and hence to contribute to this important religious shift. For example, several of our texts have various people, including Ajātaśatru, show great respect for the Buddha at an early point in the story. Superficially this does not change the sutra very much, but at a deeper level it affects the meaning of the text substantially. Suspense is removed, the king no longer needs to test the Buddha, a successful outcome of the teaching process is guaranteed. Before the Buddha has had a chance to act the conversion and liberation of the king is underway.

Degree of Change

One may classify scriptural traditions broadly as conservative or innovative as regards their treatment of received texts. By and

---

[141] Above, pp. 136, 187.

large, the scriptural traditions of Small Vehicle Buddhism tend to be much more conservative than those of Mahāyāna, but within the former group distinctions must be made. All Small Vehicle textual traditions are not animated by the same spirit. In the case of our texts, C3 stands apart from the rest; judged within this particular context it is very innovative indeed. The additions made to the sutra in this case are not merely lines of praise, nor are they set formulae simply transposed from some other context. Whole verses are found here that are not only unique among versions of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra, but, so far as I can discover, unique in Buddhist literature. Perhaps even more indicative of the innovativeness of this tradition are the deletions from the sutra, for here we find a rather free and easy approach to scripture, and an apparent disregard for the exact preservation of Buddhavacana, that is not seen in the other versions. With these changes in form, furthermore, comes a serious shift in meaning. The monk is firmly thrust into the background. The point is no longer that one should journey from outwardness to inwardness, but that good (meritorious) activity in the world brings reward, and that this reward can be enjoyed here and now. As far as the śramaṇa is concerned, he may be a notch higher in the grade of his action and the quality of his reward but he is not a unique sort of individual who toils in a radically different sphere from others, as he is in the other versions of the text.

In dealing with this particular version (C3), two problems therefore stand out. We want to know what was responsible for the creative ethos of this scriptural tradition, and we want to know what

has caused the particular shift in meaning found here. It is likely that the affiliation of the Chinese Ekottara with Mahāyāna provides the solution to both problems. That the changes in meaning are due to Mahāyāna influence has already been argued above.[142] As far as ethos is concerned, it is well known that Mahāyāna brought with it a quite new attitude to truth and creativity. As long as scripture aimed at preserving the insight of a particular being belonging to the past (Śākyamuni Buddha) it was necessary to guard the letter of scripture jealously lest the content of the insight be lost. But when it became accepted, as it did in Mahāyāna, that the transmitters of the scripture were themselves bodhisattvas, beings who were potential Buddhas and in whom the highest truth was latent, it was not necessary to fear innovation. Truth could be expressed creatively.

But what, then, is the exact relationship of the Ekottara with Mahāyāna? One is told that there are Mahāyānist "interpolations" in this collection,[143] and one gets the impression that followers of the Mahāyāna tampered with it in rather a superficial way, inserting their characteristic terms and expressions here and there.

But what we actually find is that an entire sutra from this collection, chosen at random, has been thoroughly re-shaped in the Mahāyāna spirit. There are, to be sure, Mahāyānist terms and expressions found in C3, but these are of less importance than the broader changes in form and substance. It appears likely, therefore, that the Ekottara was not merely tampered with, but actually transmitted by, members of

---

[142] Above, p. 277.

[143] Warder, Indian Buddhism, p. 9 and Histoire, p. 171.

the Mahāyāna movement. It appears to have been living scripture for them (as suggested by the preface to the collection)[144] and to have been deemed worthy of transmission alongside of the distinctive Mahāyāna productions. If this is the case the Ekottara becomes a fascinating object of study, for it allows us to examine in detail the interplay of Small Vehicle and Mahāyāna Buddhism.

The other versions of the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra all represent quite conservative traditions, yet here again distinctions must be made. C2 is quite innovative, but is so in rather a clumsy way. Some of its innovativeness, and much of its clumsiness, is probably due to inept translation into Chinese. Of all the versions, this appears to me to be the only one that may have undergone significant alteration (largely detrimental and mostly unintentional) during the translation process. Yet despite the confusion and corruption the text achieves literary unity in its treatment of the theme of peace, and many of the specific changes and corruptions are used in the service of this larger purpose. Of the remaining versions, P is the closest to the ancient text. However, whether P's proximity to the ancient version is due to conservative ethos or simply to the fact that Theravādin scripture was fixed at an early date is not clear. One may perhaps say that writing down one's scripture in order to preserve it from change, while other sects continue to transmit orally, is itself indicative of conservatism; but it would certainly be a mistake to regard the Theravāda as remaining conservative throughout its history with

---

[144]Above, p. 27.

regard to such processes as divinization and universalization. Our study of Buddhaghosa's commentary, which comes from roughly the same period as that of the finalization of the other texts in question, has shown these processes to have been quite as lively at this time in the Theravādin sect as in the other sects. The Theravādin claim that the Pali Canon was committed to writing in the first century B.C. is thus supported.[145] It is supported not only by the proximity of P to the ancient text, but by the fact that material found only in the Commentary in the Pali tradition makes its appearance in the scripture of other traditions. The latter were obviously open to the incorporation of such material for a longer time.[146] In addition, it may be speculated that the Pali text's relative freedom from textual corruption stems not only from its antiquity but from a certain degree of editing. The traditional account is that at the time of committing the canon to writing the monks assembled specifically for this purpose,[147] and it is natural that some critical comparison of texts would have preceded

---

[145]See H. Oldenberg, ed. and trans., The Dīpavaṃsa (London: Williams and Norgate, 1879), pp. 103, 211, and W. Geiger, ed., The Māhavaṃṣa (London: Henry Frowde, 1908), p. 277. We are concerned here, of course, only with sutra portion of the canon.

[146]Cf. Waldschmidt's remark with regard to the Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra: "Die Pāli-Tradition kennt Parallelen zu gewissen Punkten dieses Einschubs, doch finden sich diese nicht in den kanonischen Texten, sondern in der Kommentatoren-Literatur." He goes on to say that: "Es ist zwar zuzugeben, dass in das MPS [the Sanskrit version of the sutra] Erweiterungen einer jungen Überlieferungs-schicht (c) aufgenommen worden sind, denen sich der Pali-Kanon verschlossen hat." Die Überlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha, pp. 352 and 353 respectively.

[147]See Oldenberg, ed. and trans., The Dīpavaṃsa, pp. 103, 211, and Geiger, ed., The Māhavaṃsa, p. 277.

the final fixing of scripture. Even a rather casual perusal and discussion by the learned monks would have been sufficient to eliminate most of the sorts of corruption one finds, for example, in the Chinese Dīrgha.

In the early fixation of the Pali sutra material lie both its strength and its weakness for the study of Buddhist scripture. In informing us of the oldest textual levels it is uniquely valuable; in informing us of the change, growth and adaptation of these texts through time, we must turn to other sources.

CONCLUSION

In the third century B.C. there was a text in the Buddhist canon called "The Sutra on the Fruits of the Life of a Śramaṇa". Indeed, there were undoubtedly by this time already several versions of it in existence. We have an excellent idea of what this text (or group of texts) looked like. Quite close to the existing Pali version but somewhat shorter, it dealt economically and powerfully with several themes of great importance to early Buddhism. It portrayed the Buddha as an enlightened and skilled teacher and showed this skill in action in the conversion of the infamous king of Magadha, Ajātaśatru. It contrasted external and internal mastery, showing the superiority of the latter and how it could be attained; it helped define the Buddhist notion of peace and indicated where this peace could be found; it made clear the Buddhist view of action and recompense, showing how, in contrast to other religious systems of the time, the Buddhist dharma gave meaning to both the morality of the layman and the special striving of the monk. In these various ways it displayed the "fruits of the life of the śramaṇa", that is, the outcome and purpose of radical religious effort, in the face of criticism of this mode of action prevalent at the time.

By the fifth century A.D. there were numerous, quite distinct versions of this sutra in existence. The study of those that have survived from this and later periods of history has given us a good sense of the general shape of this family of texts. It is impossible

to make an objective judgement as to whether it is the unity or the diversity of the text family that is more striking and more important. Some readers will be impressed by the essential similarity of the texts, and will take this as a proof either of conservativism of Small Vehicle Buddhism (and the accuracy of the transmission process), or of the success of the ancient text in expressing fundamental human needs and values, in such a way that subsequent modification of structure was unnecessary. Others, however, may be impressed by the diversity and creativity of the various forms of the sutra, and may find it necessary to revise their views of Small Vehicle Buddhism and its canon accordingly. In any case, the changes seen in the later versions of this scripture are sufficient to inform us of the pressures at work on Small Vehicle Buddhism in the course of its development, and the way the textual transmission operated to respond to these pressures and needs.

Future research should yield more precise knowledge of the oldest phases of the history of the sutra. We already know that a hundred or so years before the time of the "ancient text" studied in the present work there was in existence a text of the same name.[1] Furthermore, the text had the same chief characters (Ajātaśatru and the Buddha), the same geographical and temporal setting, and, as indicated by its title, the same main topic. It is in fact likely that the fourth century B.C. version was very similar in most respects

---

[1]This and the following comments are based on the Mahāsāṅghika evidence.

to the text reconstructed in the present work, although this admittedly cannot be proven (and of course one cannot be sure in what particular respects the two forms would agree and disagree). Further studies in Buddhist literature, and especially in the Dīrgha Āgama, should allow increasingly primitive stages of the text to be discovered.[2] The comparison of the extant versions carried out herein ought to provide a solid basis for such researches.

The present study indicates that in all attempts to reconstruct the most ancient stages of sutra literature the Pali Canon is of quite exceptional importance, due largely to its having been closed to change at a relatively early date. Naturally, however, it is precisely this character of the Pali Canon that limits its usefulness to the study of the later development of scriptural tradition. To find out what was happening in Small Vehicle Buddhism in the middle of the first millenium A.D., one cannot rely on texts finalized centuries earlier, and to discover what Small Vehicle Buddhism meant to the people of China and Tibet it will not do to consult the Pali Canon, whose influence upon these countries was virtually nil. In such researches,

---

[2]It may turn out that the ancient text is the result of a process of growth and development from a small original core of material, but this cannot be assumed to have been the case. There is no reason to believe that all of the long sutras of the Dīrgha were once short accounts of events or brief "sayings of the Buddha", which grew gradually to the present forms. Many may have been long from the time of their composition. As far as the present study is concerned, while the later versions belonging to conservative textual traditions are somewhat longer than the ancient text, all of the main parts and major themes are found in the latter. Not only was the Śrāmaṇyaphala a long sutra in the third century B.C., but it was apparently already long in the fourth century B.C. See above, pp. 107-108.

therefore, the use of later texts is not merely excusable but essential. The Ekottara Āgama preserved in Chinese, for example, emerges in this thesis as a work of extraordinary interest, for it appears to be a synthesis of Small Vehicle and Mahāyāna religiosity.

It is hoped that efforts such as the present one will lay the groundwork for a history of Buddhist literature that will do justice to the vitality of Buddhist scripture. This vitality can only be appreciated if attention is given to the growth and development that such texts underwent as people turned to them for inspiration and guidance under ever-changing circumstances. And it can be appreciated only when the attempt is made to look beyond the outer shape of the literature to its meaning, for herein above all lies its life.

APPENDIX

The Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra in Art

There is apparently only one ancient artistic representation of the events of the sutra. This is a sculpture found on a corner pillar of the Western Gateway at Bhārhut, dating from somewhere between the late second and early first centuries B.C.[1] It may be sufficient to quote Heinrich Lüders' description of this piece, supplementing it with observations relative to the present study.

After a brief summary of the Sāmaññaphala Sutta Lüders remarks:

> The sculpture conforms to the story in every detail. In the lower part the king is seen sitting on his state-elephant with a female attendant bearing the parasol behind him. To his right there are two more elephants mounted by two women. They have much smaller tusks than the elephant of the king, apparently to show that they are she-elephants as stated in the text. In the right corner another elephant with large tusks is kneeling, the female-mahout sitting far back near the tail. This is the elephant of Jīvaka, who has dismounted and is talking to the king as indicated

---

[1]See Alexander Cunningham, The Stūpa of Bhārhut (Reprint; Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1962), especially pp. 89-90, Plate XVI, fig. 3, Plate LIV, inscription no. 62, for the earliest work on this material. Cunningham's remarks as expressed in this work (originally published in 1879) have been complemented and in some cases superseded by more recent studies. See, for example, Heinrich Lüders, ed., Bhārhut Inscriptions, revised by E. Waldschmidt and M. A. Mehendale (Ootacamund: Government Epigraphist for India, 1963), as well as Malalasekara, ed., Encyclopaedia of Buddhism (Ceylon: Government Press, 1961), s.v. Bhārhut.

> by his raised right hand. Two trees laden with manoges show that the scene is Jīvaka's Mango Grove. The seat of the Buddha is in the upper right corner below a parasol with pendants hanging down from it. The presence of the Buddha is symbolized by his footprints on the foot-rest. The king is kneeling before the seat, while Jīvaka and four women are standing behind him with their hands reverentially folded. A burning swing-lamp indicates that the visit takes place at night.[2]

The inscription accompanying the sculpture leaves no doubt as to the event being described. It is: Ajātasatu bhagavato vaṃdate ("Ajātasatu worships the Holy One").[3]

On the whole, the work fits well with our ancient text. It is interesting, for example, that the lamps burning in the pavilion, as well as the contrast between the bull elephant of the king and the cow elephants of his women, are portrayed in the sculpture, both details having been judged on textual evidence to have been likely present in the ancient text, even though they are missing from some extant versions.[4]

According to the sculpture the king has a parasol (or umbrella, chattra) over him as he rides his elephant to the mango grove. This parasol is not in evidence when he kneels to the Buddha, being replaced

---

[2]Bhārhut Inscriptions, pp. 118-119. See also Lüders' similar remarks in his Bhārhut und die buddhistische Literatur (Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1941), p. 164.

[3]Both the reading of the inscription and the translation follow Lüders, Bhārhut Inscriptions, p. 118.

[4]See above, pp. 137, 139-140.

by the parasol over the Buddha's throne, so it is fair to conclude that the king has discarded it before approaching the Lord. The portrayal of Ajātaśatru casting aside the symbols of his royalty and acknowledging the royalty of the Buddha fits well with our text, but such an event is not explicitly mentioned in the oldest versions. In this respect the sculpture seems to represent a slightly more developed form of the sutra than the ancient text. On the other hand, there is no evidence in the sculpture of the systematic discarding of the five royal insignia mentioned in C1 and C2, and in fact the king still wears his head-dress when kneeling before the Buddha.

Other features of the piece reinforce the hypothesis that it reflects a state of the sutra somewhat later than the ancient text but not as late as several of the most developed texts. The king's kneeling posture before the Buddha, for example, strikes a note somewhere between the simple respectful greeting found in the Pali text and the complete prostration upon the ground mentioned in certain other texts (C3 and C4). It probably fits best with C1's description of Ajātaśatru honouring the Lord's feet with his head. Similarly, in place of the simple picture of the Buddha sitting against the middle pillar presented in the Pali text, we find the Buddha represented by a throne (no middle pillar being in evidence). This is, however, the rather primitive "altar-throne"[5] customarily represented at Bhārhut, essentially a decorated

---

[5]The term is from Jeannine Auboyer, Le Trône et son symbolisme dans l'Inde ancienne, pp. 10ff. See her description of this type of throne, ibid., and her illustration of it, p. 19, Plate Ia of the same work.

rectangular stone slab; it is far from the much more advanced "lion-throne" (simhāsana) mentioned in C1. In its manner of presenting the royalty of the Buddha, therefore, the sculpture again gives evidence of a stage of development somewhere between the most ancient and the latest levels of the sutra. It is unwise to go beyond this and look for a textual reference to this altar-throne, for the latter is the most common symbol of the Buddha at Bhārhut[6] and is obviously meant in a general way to indicate his presence rather than to transfer to stone specific textual descriptions.

The lack of detail in the Bhārhut sculpture makes further analysis impossible. The work, however, is an important witness. It tells us that the sutra was not merely in existence in the first (or second) century B.C., but that it was well known and regarded as recounting an important event in the life of the Buddha. Further, it confirms the picture of the text of this period indicated by our textual research and assures us that our method is based on sound principles.

---

[6]Cunningham, The Stūpa of Bhārhut, p. 90.

ABBREVIATIONS

1. More detailed information on the following works is to be found in the Bibliography.

2. Although I have followed standard practice in referring to the Pali sources in terms of the volume and page numbers of the Pali Text Society's editions in Roman script, I have throughout followed the more recent Devanāgarī edition of the Pali Canon (ed. Bikkhu J. Kashyap), which includes the PTS volume and page numbers in the margins.

Ājīvikas	A. L. Basham, History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas
AN	Aṅguttara Nikāya
Conciles	André Bareau, Les Premiers conciles bouddhiques
Dialogues	T. W. and C. A. F. Rhys Davids, trans., Dialogues of the Buddha
DN	Dīgha Nikāya
Histoire	Étienne Lamotte, Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien
Kindred	C. A. F. Rhys Davids and F. L. Woodward, trans., The Book of the Kindred Sayings
Life	W. W. Rockhill, The Life of the Buddha
Middle	I. B. Horner, trans., The Middle Length Sayings
MN	Majjhima Nikāya
PTSD	T. W. Rhys Davids and W. Stede, eds., The Pāli Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary
Sectes	André Bareau, Les Sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule

Six Heretics	Claus Vogel, The Teachings of the Six Heretics
SN	Saṃyutta Nikāya
Sn	Sutta Nipāta
Sumaṅgala.	Buddhaghosa's Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī, I, edited by T. W. Rhys Davids and J. E. Carpenter
T.	Takakusu and Watanabe, ed., Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The primary sources bearing most directly on this study have been described in Chapter I. For information on specific works within the various canons, see these earlier remarks.

Books

Auboyer, Jeannine. *Le Trône et son symbolisme dans l'Inde ancienne.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1949.

Bareau, André. *Les Premiers conciles bouddhiques.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955.

________. *Les Sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule.* Saigon: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1955.

________. *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapiṭaka et les Vinayapiṭaka anciens.* 2 pts. in 3 vols. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1963-71.

Barua, B. *A History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philsophy.* Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1921.

Basham, A. L. *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas.* London: Luzac, 1951.

Brough, John. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada.* London: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Chakraborti, H. *Asceticism in Ancient India.* Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1973.

Chattopadhyaya, Debiprasad. *Lokāyata: A Study in Ancient Indian Materialism.* 3rd ed. New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1973.

Chau, T. M. *The Chinese Madhyama Āgama and the Pāli Majjhima Nikāya: A Comparative Study.* Saigon: Saigon Institute of Higher Buddhist Studies, 1964.

Chavannes, E., trans. Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripitaka chinois, IV. Reprint. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1962.

Conze, Edward. Buddhism: Its Essence and Development. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.

Cowell, E. B., ed. The Jātaka. Translated by Cowell and others. Reprinted as 6 vols. in 3. London: Luzac, for the Pali Text Society, 1969.

Cunningham, Alexander. The Stūpa of Bhārhut. Reprint. Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1962.

Dutt, N., ed. Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part IV (Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinayavastu). Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press, 1950.

Fausbøll, M. V., ed. The Jātaka. 7 vols. Reprint. London: Luzac, for the Pali Text Society, 1962-64.

Franke, R. O., trans. Dīghanikāya. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.

Frauwallner, Erich. The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature. Vol. VIII of Serie Orientale Roma. Rome: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1956.

Geiger, Wilhelm, ed. The Mahavaṃsa. London: Henry Frowde, for the Pali Text Society, 1908.

_______. Pāli Literature and Language. Translated by Batakrishna Ghosh. 2nd ed. Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1968.

Grimblot, M. P., ed. Sept suttas pālis tirés du Dīgha-Nikāya. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1876.

Hofinger, M. Étude sur la concile de Vaiśālī. Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon, 1946.

Horner, I. B., trans. The Middle Length Sayings [Majjhima Nikāya]. 3 vols. Reprint. London: Luzac, for the Pali Text Society, 1967-70.

Jacobi, Hermann, trans. The Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra, in Jaina Sūtras, Part II. Vol. XLV of Sacred Books of the East. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1968.

Jayatilleke, K. N. Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge. London: Allen and Unwin, 1963.

Johnston, E. H., ed. and trans. The Buddhacarita. Originally 2 vols.; reprinted as 1 vol. containing the Sanskrit text and English translation. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1972.

Kashyap, J., Bhikkhu, ed. [The Pāli Tipiṭaka in Devanāgarī]. Nālandā-Devanāgarī-Pāli-Series. 41 vols. Pali Publication Board, Bihar Government, 1956-1961.

Lamotte, Étienne. Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1958.

Law, B. C., ed. Buddhistic Studies. 2 vols. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co., 1931.

________. A History of Pali Literature. 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1933.

Lüders, Heinrich. Bhārhut und die buddhistische Literatur. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XXVI, 3. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1941. Reprinted 1966 by Kraus Reprint Ltd.

________, ed. Bhārhut Inscriptions. Revised by E. Waldschmidt and M. A. Mehendale. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. II, Part II. Ootacamund: Government Epigraphist for India, 1963.

Majumdar, R. C., ed. The Age of Imperial Unity. Vol. II of The History and Culture of the Indian People. Reprint. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1960.

Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎. Butten no kenkyū 佛典の研究. Tokyo, 1914.

Mayeda Egaku 前田恵學. Genshi Bukkyo Seiten no seiritsushi kenkyū 原始佛教聖典の成立史研究 [English title: A History of the Formation of Original Buddhist Texts]. Tokyo: Sankibo-Busshorin, 1964.

Neumann, K. E., trans. Die Reden Gotamo Buddhos, II, Längere Sammlung [Dīgha Nikāya]. 3rd ed. Zurich: Artemis, 1957.

Oldenberg, Hermann, ed. and trans. The Dīpavaṃsa. London: Williams and Norgate, 1879.

Pachow, W. A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa. Santiniketan: Sino-Indian Cultural Society, 1955.

Pande, G. C. Studies in the Origins of Buddhism. Allahabad: University of Allahabad, 1957.

Przyluski, Jean. Le Concile de Rājagṛha. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1926-28.

Radhakrishnan, S., ed. and trans. The Dhammapada. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Rhys Davids, C. A. F. and F. L. Woodward, trans. The Book of the Kindred Sayings [Saṃyutta Nikāya]. 5 vols. Reprint. London: Luzac, for the Pali Text Society, 1950-65.

Rhys Davids, T. W. and C. A. F., trans. Dialogues of the Buddha, Parts I-III [Dīgha Nikāya]. Vols. II-IV of Sacred Books of the Buddhists. 3 vols. Reprint, with some revisions to Part II since the original publication of 1899-1921. London: Luzac, for the Pali Text Society, 1971-73.

Rhys Davids, T. W., J. E. Carpenter, and W. Stede. The Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī, Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīgha-Nikāya. 2 vols. Part I published in 1886 (London: Henry Frowde, for the Pali Text Society); Part II published in 1931 (London: Oxford University Press, for the Pali Text Society).

Rockhill, W. W., ed. and trans. The Life of the Buddha. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1884.

Sāmaññaphala Sutta (Dīgha Nikāya: Sīlakkhandhavagga). Translated by the English Editorial Department, Union Buddha Sāsana Council. Buddha Sāsana Council Publications, No. 31, 1958.

Suzuki, D. T., ed. The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition. Reprint of the Otani University original. Tokyo: Tibetan Research Institute, 1957-58.

Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭, eds. Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo 大正新脩大藏經. 85 vols. Reprint, with some corrections. Tokyo: Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo Kanko Kai (Society for the Publication of the Taisho Tripitaka), 1962-

Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽. Indo tetsugaku kenkyū 印度哲學研究. 6 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965.

Vaidya, P. L., ed. Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1960.

Vogel, Claus. The Teachings of the Six Heretics. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XXXIX, 4. Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft. Wiesbaden: Komissionsverlag Franz Steiner G.m.b.H., 1970.

Waldschmidt, Ernst. Die Überlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1944-48.

________, ed. Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra. Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. 3 vols. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1950-51.

Warder, A. K. Indian Buddhism. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

Woodward, F. L. and E. M. Hare, trans. The Book of the Gradual Sayings [Aṅguttara Nikāya]. 5 vols. Reprint. London: Luzac, for the Pali Text Society, 1960-65.

Articles

Anesaki, M. "Some Problems of the Textual History of the Buddhist Scriptures", in his Katam Karaniyam (edited by Tomonobu Ishibashi). Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1936.

Bapat, P. V. "The Different Strata in the Literary Material of the Dīgha Nikāya", Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, VIII (1926), 1-16.

________. "The Śrāmaṇyaphala-Sūtra and Its Different Versions in Buddhist Literature", Indian Culture, XV (1948-49), 107-114.

________. "Another Valuable Collection of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts, Containing among Others the Śrāmaṇya-phala Sūtra in Sanskrit", Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, XXX (1949), 241-253.

Bareau, André. "La Jeunesse du Buddha dans les Sūtrapiṭaka et les Vinayapiṭaka anciens", Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, LXI (1974), 199-274.

________. "Le Parinirvāṇa du Buddha et la naissance de la religion bouddhique", Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, LXI (1974), 275-299.

Behrsing, S. "Das Chung-Tsi-King des Chinesischen Dīrghāgama," Asia Major, VII (1931), 1-149, 483.

Clark, W. E. "Some Problems in the Criticism of the Sources for Early Buddhist History", The Harvard Theological Review, XXIII (1930), 121-147.

Conze, Edward. "Recent Progress in Buddhist Studies", in his Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies. Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1967.

Franke, R. O. "Die Buddhalehre in ihrer erreichbar-ältesten Gestalt (im Dīghanikāya)", Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LXIX (1915), 455-490; LXXI (1917), 50-98.

Jaini, P. S. "Śramaṇas: Their Conflict with Brāhmanical Society". Chapter II of Chapters in Indian Civilization, Vol. I (Classical and Medieval India), pp. 39-81. 2nd ed. Kendall, Hunt Pub. Co., 1970.

Mizuno Kogen 水野弘元. [Supplementary remarks on the Dīrgha and Ekottara Āgamas], in Kokuyaku issaikyō 國譯一切經. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1969-71, Āgama Section, Part 7, pp. 499-515; Part 8, pp. 415-429.

Warder, A. K. "On the Relationships between Early Buddhism and Other Contemporary Systems", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, XVIII (1956), 43-63.

Weller, F. "Über den Aufbau des Pātikasuttanta", Asia Major, Hirth Anniversary Volume (1922), 560-574; Asia Major, V (1928), 104-140.

________. "Die Überlieferung des Älteren Buddhistischen Schrifttums", Asia Major, V (1928), 149-182.

________. "Über das Brahmajālasūtra", Asia Major, IX (1933), 195-332; 381-440.

Reference Works

(excluding general language dictionaries)

Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善. Indo Bukkyō koyūmeishi jiten, genshikihen 印度佛教固有名詞辭典原始期篇 (A Dictionary of Indian Buddhist Proper Names, Primitive Period). Nagoya: 1930-31.

________. The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas and Pali Nikāyas. 2nd ed. Tokyo: Hajinkaku-Shobō, 1958.

Anesaki, M. "The Four Buddhist Āgamas in Chinese, a Concordance of Their Parts and of the Corresponding Counterparts in the Pali Nikāyas", Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan, XXXV (1908), Pt. 3, 1-149.

Bagchi, P. C. Le Canon bouddhique en Chine. Vols. I and IV of Sino-Indica: Publications de l'Université de Calcutta. 2 vols. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1927-38.

Daizōkyō sakuin 大藏經索引. (Index to the Taisho Tripitaka). Tokyo: published by Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo Kanko Kai (Society for the Publication of the Taisho Tripitaka) for Daizōkyō Gakujutsu Yōgo Kenkyū Kai (Research Association for the Terminology of the Taisho Tripitaka), 1975-

Edgerton, Franklin. Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary. 2 vols. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

Levi, S., J. Takakusu, and P. Demiéville, eds. Hōbōgirin: Fasicule Annexe (Tables du Taishō Issaikyō). Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise, 1931.

Malalasekera, G. P. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. 2 vols. Reprint. London: Luzac, for the Pali Text Society, 1960.

_______. [here spelled Malalasekara], ed. *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism.* Ceylon: Government Press, 1961.

Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨. *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten* 望月佛教大辭典. 10 vols. Kyoto: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1954-63.

Oda Tokunō 織田得能. *Bukkyō daijiten* 佛教大辭典. Tokyo: Daizō Shoten, 1930.

Rhys Davids, T. W. and W. Stede, eds. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*. Reprint. London: Luzac, for the Pali Text Society, 1959.

Soothill, W. E. and Lewis Hodous. *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms*. Reprint. Taipei: Ch'eng-Wen Pub. Co., 1968.

Woodward, F. L. and others. *Pali Tipitakaṃ Concordance*. Edited by Hare, Norman and Warder. London: Luzac, for the Pali Text Society, 1952-